

Just Weights  
AND  
MEASURES;  
*That is,*  
THE PRESENT STATE  
OF  
RELIGION  
Weighed in the Balance,  
AND  
Measured by the Standard  
OF THE  
SANCTUARY:

---

*According to the Opinion of*  
**HERBERT THORNDIKE.**

---

**The Second Edition.**

---

**L O N D O N,**

Printed by *S. Roycroft*, for *J. Martyn*, and are to be sold  
at the Sign of the *Bell* in *St. Pauls Church-yard*, 1680.



DONAVIT REV. VIR

*RA. PERKINS, L.L.D.*

ECCLESIAE hujus CANONICUS.

A.D. 1732.

T O A L L  
Christian READERS.

**I** Have heard, that in the time of our Late Troubles the Presbyterians were put to *nonplus* by the Fanaticks, demanding of them a ground in the Scripture for a *National* Church. I let pass that mistake of both Parties, which the term of *National* involveth. For the state of the Question must needs concern that part of the Church, which every respective Sovereignty containeth. Now one Sovereignty may contain several Nations; as there are two in this Kingdom of *England*. But we need not marvel, that they could give no answer to a demand, which their own Title allowed them no ground to answer. Had they believed the Creed, (which they thrust out of the Church) and that Article of it, which professeth *one Catholick Church*, they might have had an Answer to it; but such a one, as would have destroyed the pretense of their Presbyteries. For were the Unity of the Church, which that Article professeth, meerly invisible with God

*To all Christian Readers.*

by Communion in his Spirit, the Usurpers of Sovereign Power might make Presbyteries Churches by as good a Title, as that by which they make themselves Sovereigns. But the Unity which that Article professeth is Visible, with that Church which is, or ought to be always one and the same from our Lord and his Apostles, (by Communion in the Offices of Gods Service, especially the Eucharist) to distinguish it from Heresies and Schisms, whom the Title of *Catholick* visibly distinguisheth from the Church. That Title the Presbyteries cannot pretend to; because it is as visible, that their Authority is derived from the Long Parliament, and their own consent; as it is visible, that the Authority of the Whole Church is derived from our Lord and his Apostles.

For the Unity of the Church is not derived from *Constantine*, but from our Lord and his Apostles, and the Law imposed by them upon all Christians, to maintain Communion among themselves upon those terms, which the Common Christianity, supposed in the said Communion, may allow, whereby the Church is Visible by being *Catholick*. It is manifest by what Title, and therefore upon what terms,  
*Constantine*

*To all Christian Readers.*

*Constantine* first in the Empire, and after him all Christian Powers in their respective Sovereignties, do make Religion a Law to their Subjects. For being to be baptized, and made a Member of the Church by the act of the Church; if all Christians by their Baptism do consecrate themselves to the service of God in his Church, then must he also by being baptized, consecrate the Power of the Empire to the maintenance of that Christianity into which he was baptized, part whereof is the Unity of the Catholick Church. And as the effect of this obligation is visible in bringing the World into the Church: so it is a visible advantage for the Church, that the Profession thereof is a Law to Christian States, by the rewards and penalties whereby it is enacted. For when all are constrained to be Christians, according to the Laws of the Land; so much the more will be Christians, according to the Laws of God and of his Church. And as it is evident, that without such Laws Unity in Religion will not prevail in the World, which cannot prevail with the help of them: No less manifest is it, that without Unity Christianity will soon come to nothing. He that considers the decay, which a little time of disunion

*To all Christian Readers.*

union hath visibly made in the Christianity of this Kingdom, is past cure by reasoning, if he question this consequence.

This is that Principle, which must justify the Reformation which we profess, by maintaining the due bounds, and terms, and measure of it. This is that which must re-unite the Parties, which hitherto are at distance, if we will have them united to the purpose of saving Souls, out of satisfaction in the Laws which they are to execute; not only to the purpose of publick Peace, for hope or fear of the rewards and penalties which they are enacted with. This is that which must secure the Conscience of the Kingdom, that those rewards and penalties will be allowed as for the service of God, at the great Day of Judgment. And how much this concerns the present case, now that Religion is to be re-established by the Law of the Land, it is manifest enough. Let the Presbyterians submit to the due terms, upon which the Fanaticks may be acknowledged Members of this Church, as acknowledging the Covenant of Baptism for the condition of holding the State of Gods Grace, and the Recusants shall stand bound to own the Faith of this Church for the Faith of the

*To all Christian Readers.*

the Catholick Church. Let the Laws of this Church be Ruled by the Laws of the Catholick Church in those times, which he that owneth one Catholick Church from the beginning, cannot disown; and all shall appear bound to be of this Church, as visibly the same Church with that which was from the beginning. For the Church is Visible by the Laws of it. And therefore if the Laws be the same, the Church is visibly the same: And all that are not of it, shall be evidently liable to such penalties, as belong to them that disobey those Laws of their Country, which the common Christianity requireth.

Let no man then marvel, that being settled in this Opinion, upon all the consideration which our long distractions have allowed me time to take; I am not afraid to publish this brief view of it, referring my self for proof of the particulars to that which I have published heretofore. Let it not seem strange, that I deliver it sometimes with that resolution and assurance, which seems to admit no contradiction to it. For though the Faith of Gods Church be always the same, yet I profess of my self, that the Laws of the Primitive Church; with that allowance, which the difference



*To all Christian Readers.*

ference of the present time, and that state of Christianity which it hath introduced from that which then was, may require. And by professing this, I do really, (and not only for a formality) submit my self to the authority of Superiours, as well as to the judgment and censure of every Christian. For how far the present times are capable of those Rules, which all times are to go by, that would be one and the same Church with that which was from the beginning; I take not upon me to judge, as belonging to the account of Superiours. Nay before I have done, you shall see I compromise my Opinion it self, (and not only my own proceeding according, or not contrary to it) to the authority of Superiours, and to better judgment. And therefore let it be lawful to plead for the improving of the Laws of this Church, so long as it is lawful to plead for the abolishing of the Laws of this Kingdom. For as it is manifest, that our Ecclesiastical Laws are the Laws of the Kingdom: so would I not open my mouth for improving them, were it not to make them the Laws of Gods only true Church.

T. H. E



# THE CONTENTS.

## CHAP. I.

**I**F the Church of Rome be a true Church, Reformation is the restoring of that which hath been. If the Pope be Antichrist, and the Papists Idolaters, the Church of Rome not true Church, if no Visible Church, then no sin of Schism. Antichrist may be an Idolater, but cannot be the Head of a Church. Though it were Idolatry to worship the Host, yet to kneel at the Communion would be Holy. That which the Church of Rome professeth is not Idolatry, if it be a true Church. They that separate from the Church of Rome as Idolaters are thereby Schismatics before God.

Pag. 2

## CHAP. II.

The supposition of Antichrist and Idolatry prejudicial to the truth. The supposition of one Visible Church, the ground of Communion, as well within the Reformation, as in the whole Church. What the Romish Missionaries get by the charge of Heresie, and the pretence of infallibility. What we get by the charge of Idolatry and Antichrist. Immoderate charges vain on both sides. The charge of Schism on both sides moderate, as to the Church. The Sin of Schism, as to God, horrible. The Schism of the Donatists, in charging the Catholicks to be Apostates. The sad consequences of that Schism.

p. 8

## CHAP. III.

They that hold by one Visible Church are to own the consequences of it. Nothing to be changed, but upon that ground. We cannot be the same Church with that which was, otherwise. Though that which shall be settled will find Advocates. Civil Laws of Religion to be changed, till this Rule be attained. The beginning and rise of our differences. The present state of them. What terms of agreement, with the Presbyterians, we ought to allow. The Laws of the Primitive Church

b

the

## The Contents.

*the Standard of all change. Our present Case is not the Case of our Forefathers. The Acts of Henry VIII. no Acts of our Forefathers in Religion. Imperfections of Laws, in Religion, no imputation to our Forefathers. The pretence of tender Consciences is no Rule. It serves Papists, as well as Puritans.*

p. 15

### CHAP. IV.

*Eraſtians can acknowledge no Viſible Church founded by God. Their opinion inableth Sovereigns to perſecute Gods truth by Gods Law. Perſecuting the truth is the uſe of a Power which no Sovereign can have. If any Sovereign may puniſh for the Religion which he profeſſeth, then are Subjects bound to renounce Chriſt, if the Sovereign command it. No offence, but charity in declaring the true ground of reconcilment, or puniſhment. Why it ought to be declared. The declaring of it no offence to Superiors.*

p. 24

### CHAP. V.

*We have the ſame evidence for the Viſible Unity of the Church, as for the truth of the Scriptures. The Church founded upon the Power of the Keys. The Unity of the Church Viſible by the Laws of it. The Law which endoweth the Church with consecrated Goods. How the Unity of the Church is ſignified by the Scriptures. How in the Old Teſtament.*

p. 29

### CHAP. VI.

*How far the Scriptures are clear to be underſtood, of themſelves. Tradition limiteth the ſenſe of the Scripture. Difference between the Tradition of Faith and Ritual Traditions. The difference between Hereſie and Schiſm. The dependence of Churches evidenceth the Unity of the Whole Church. The form of this dependence throughout the Roman Empire. No exception to be made to it, for the Britiſh Church. Episcopacy, by this form, inviolable in all Opinions: And the Church a ſtanding Synod. The Church Viſible by diſowning Hereticks and Schiſmaticks. The breaches that have come to paſs evidence the ſame.*

p. 35

CHAP.

## The Contents.

### CHAP. VII.

*Reformation to be bounded by that wherein the Visible Church agreeth. No change, without regard to the Rules of the Catholick Church. Regular authority in the Church of Rome the means of Unity; absolute, of Schisms. How we are visibly one with the only Church of God reforming without the Church of Rome.* P. 45

### CHAP. VIII.

*What means God hath provided private Christians to discern the true Church. The duty of all Estates for the re-uniting of Schism. The ground and extent of Secular power in Church matters. How the conscience of Sovereign power is discharged, maintaining the Church.* P. 49

### CHAP. IX.

*Difficulty in receiving the Fanaticks into this Church. How their Positions destroy the Faith. Absolute Predestination to Glory destructive to Christianity. Justifying Faith includeth the profession of Christianity. The Nature of Faith, according to the Scriptures, sheweth the same. So doth the State of that Question which St. Paul disputeth. The consent of the Church herein, with the ground of it. The sense of this Church.* P. 54

### CHAP. X.

*Why Justifying Faith is not trust in God through Christ. Of Justification according to the Council of Trent. Of justification according to Socinus. Wherein his Heresie consisteth. How the misunderstanding of Satisfaction and Imputation occasioned it. Upon what grounds he is to be refused. The helps of Grace granted in consideration of Christs obedience. And therefore, they infer Original Sin, by the fall of Adam. Wherein the Covenant of Grace consisteth. That the state of Grace is forfeited by heinous sin. The danger of the contrary Position according to the ground of it.* P. 63

## The Contents.

### CHAP. XI.

*What Law of God it is, that may be fulfilled by a Christian. Of doing more then Gods Law requireth: Whether our Lord gave a new Law, or not. Of the Satisfaction and Merit of Christian Works. Original Sin is not Adams sin imputed to his Posterity. Wherein Original Sin consisteth. What Original Righteousness signifieth. What good the Unregenerate are able to do by the Law of Nature.* p. 73

### CHAP. XII.

*Upon what terms, that which is possible may become future. The difference between necessity antecedent and consequent. The difference between freedom from necessity and from bondage. Freedom from necessity always requireth indetermination, not always indifference. The Object determineth the Will, saving the freedom of it. Whence the certainty of future contingencies ariseth. How this appears in the Scriptures. God no cause of sin, according to the Scriptures. Concerning the middle knowledg of God.* p. 80.

### CHAP. XIII.

*No absolute Predestination to Glory. Predestination to Grace, absolute. How Glory is the end of Grace. In what terms the Faith of the Church standeth, as concerning this point.* p. 86

### CHAP. XIV.

*Duty of a Christian as a Christian, and as a Member of the Church. How Anabaptists deny the Faith; how they are to be reconciled with the Church. Their Error in rebaptizing for want of dipping. What concerns Salvation, in the Sacrament of the Eucharist. How the Elements are consecrated into the body and blood of Christ, according to Gregory Nyssene. The consequence hereof, in the Errors concerning the Eucharist. How the Eucharist a Sacrifice, and yet no ground for private Masses. The Eucharist, not the Sermon, the Chief Office of Gods service.* p. 91

CHAP,

# The Contents.

## CHAP. XV.

*The ground that determines the Form of our Service. The Offices, of which the Service is to consist. Of the use of the Psalms. Of reading the Scriptures commonly called Apocrypha. What Preaching it is that the Scripture commendeth. There may be Preaching without Sermons, and Sermons without Preaching. The difference between the second Service in the Antient Church, and our Communion Service. The general Preface, and the Prayers of the Church at the Eucharist. The Prayer of Oblation instituted by St. Paul; and the manner of it. The Lords Prayer at the Eucharist. The place for the Common Prayers.*

p. 97

## CHAP. XVI.

*Difference in the state of Souls departed in Grace, before Judgment. The antient Church never prayed to remove them out of Purgatory. To what purpose they were remembred at the Eucharist. The Saints departed pray for the Militant Church. Of prayers to the Saints departed. No Common Prayer in the Pulpit by gift; but in a set form, at the Communion-Table. Apostolical Graces subject to Order. Of the Graces of the Spirit in St. Paul, and the original of Litanies. The Prayers of the Eucharist how prescribed by the Apostles. Prayers of the Reformed Churches in the Pulpit; but by a form. The effect of the Long Parliament Prayers by the Spirit.*

p. 105

## CHAP. XVII.

*The Lords Day observed by the Authority of the Church. Therefore other Festivals, and times of Fasting, are to be observed. How places and persons become qualified for Gods Service. Preaching not convertible with Ministering the Sacraments. Times, places, persons, and things, consecrated to Gods Service, under the the Gospel. Ceremonies signifying by institution necessary in Gods Service. What kind of signification requisite. Not enough for the Presbyterians to allow Ceremonies.*

p. 112

## CHAP. XVIII.

*Offices which the Fathers call Sacraments, for their Ceremonies. Why the*

## The Contents.

*the Bishop only Confirmeth. The effect of Ordination requireth Ceremony in giving it. Why the Ordinations of our Presbyters are void. The necessity of Penance. The observation of Lent, and the Use of it. The necessity of private Penance, for the cure of secret sin. Of anointing the sick, according to St. James. Marriage of Christians not to be Ruled by Moses Law. Instituted Ceremonies are Sacraments with the Fathers. The Ceremonies of these Offices justify Instituted Ceremonies.*

p. 118

### CHAP. XIX.

*The worship of the Host, in the Papacy is not Idolatry. Christianity would sanctifie kneeling at the Eucharist, though it were. What Images the second Commandment forbiddeth. Reverencing of Images in Churches is not Idolatry. Of honouring Images, and of having them in Churches. Mutual forbearance, which St. Paul enjoyneth the Romans, not enjoyed elsewhere. Tender Consciences are to submit to Superiors.*

p. 125

### CHAP. XX.

*The declaration of V.Eliz.enableth Recusants to take the Oath of Supremacy. What further ambiguity that Oath involveth. What scandal the taking of it in the true sense ministrETH. That this Oath ought to be enlarged to all pretenses in Religion, that abridge Allegiance. The extent of Secular power in Reforming the Church.*

131

### CHAP. XXI.

*The pretense of Infallibility makes the breach unreconcilable. So doth the pretense of perspicuity in the Scripture. The Trial must suppose the Catholick Church. The Fanaticks further from the truth of Christianity, then the Church of Rome. The consequence of their principle worse than that of Infallibility. The point of truth in the middle between both. How salvation is concerned in the matter of free Will and Grace. Salvation concerned in the Sacraments upon the same terms. The abuses of the Church of Rome in the five Sacraments. The Grace of Ordination. The Reformation pretended, no less abuse, on the other side. The point of Reformation in the mean between both. The Superstitions of the Church of Rome. The Superstitions*



## The Contents.

*fitions of the Puritans. Why the Pope cannot be Antichrist. How it is just to reform without the See of Rome.*

p. 136

### CHAP. XXII.

*The present State of the Question concerning our Service. The Reformation pretended, abominable. Such Preaching and Praying as is usual, a hindrance of Salvation; rather then the means to it. What Order of Service, the continual Communion will require. What form of instruction this Order will require. Of that which goes before the Preface in our Communion Service. Of the Prefaces, and the Prayer of Consecration. Of the Prayer of Oblation, and the place of it. Of the Commemoration of the dead, in particular. Why the Communion Service at the Communion-Table, when no Eucharist. A secondary Proposition, according to present Law.*

p. 150

### CHAP. XXIII.

*How the Law distinguisheth Moral Precepts from Positive. How the spiritual sense of the Decalogue concerns Christians. The meaning of the First Commandment, in this sense. The extent of the Second Commandment. Of the Third Commandment. What the sanctifying of the Sabbath signifieth. The meaning of the Fifth, as to Christians. The meaning of the Five last according to Christianity.*

p. 164

### CHAP. XXIV.

*That no Clergy man ought to be of more Dioceses then one. Of inferior Orders in the Clergy, and their Offices. The conversation of the Clergy, and the use of Church Goods. The ground for promotions to higher degrees. The Universities may be serviceable to some part of this Discipline. Reasons for it. Publick fame of Sin to be purged by Ecclesiastical process. Sinners Convict by Law not to communicate before Penance. The cure of notorious sin the Bishops Office. The Church not Reformed without restoring Penance, publick or private. What means there is left for the restoring of it.*

p. 172

### CHAP.



## The Contents.

### CHAP. XXV.

*Gods mercies and judgments require the perfecting of the Reformation which we profess. The restoring of the Ecclesiastical Laws is not the restoring of the Church. Yet are we not, therefore, chargeable with Schism, by the Church of Rome. What Schism destroys the Salvation of what persons; by instances, in the most notable Schisms. Difficulty of Salvation on both sides, the Reformation remaining imperfect. An instance hereof, in the Cure of Souls departing, by the Order in force. A Supplication for a full debate of all matters in difference. The ground of Resolution, one Catholick Church, the first and chief point of the Debate. The consequence of it, in uniting the Reformed Churches. An instance in the having of Images in Churches. An objection for the Church of Rome answered. That which excuseth the Reformed Churches excuseth not our Schismatics.* p. 184

*A Letter concerning the present State of Religion amongst us. Under the Act of Establishment, persecuted by the Ordinances constituting the Triers, and Commissioners for ejecting of Scandalous Ministers.* p. 207

*The due way of composing the differences on Foot, preserving the Church, According to the Opinion of Herbert Thornecliffe.* p. 223

JUST

# J U S T

## WEIGHTS and MEASURES.

---

### CHAP. I.

*If the Church of Rome be a true Church, Reformation is the Restoring of that which hath been. If the Pope be Antichrist, and the Papists Idolaters, the Church of Rome no true Church. If no Visible Church, then no sin of Schism. Antichrist may be an Idolater, but cannot be the Head of a Church. Though it were Idolatry to worship the Host, yet to kneel at the Communion would be Holy. That which the Church of Rome professeth is not Idolatry, if it be a true Church. They that separate from the Church of Rome as Idolaters, are thereby Schismaticks before God.*

**S**ince the time that I could understand the Dispute about Religion, when it was demanded, on the behalf of the Church of Rome; Where was your Church before Luther's time? The Answer hath always been; Even where it is now. The answer was; That it is the same Church that it was; *If the Church of Rome be a true Church, Reformation is the restoring of that which hath been.*

B

A

## Just Weights

A Church which was sick, and is now cured; which was corrupted, and now is cleared of her Corruptions. This answer supposeth, that the Church of *Rome* was a true Church, when that Change, which we call Reformation, was made. And therefore granteth, (as it hath always been granted) that so it is at present. For it cannot be questioned, that it is the same Church now which then it was: Though the Council of *Trent* may have encreased the corruption of it. And upon these terms all dispute of choice in Religion comes to trial upon this issue: Whether the change that is made hath restored that which was in the beginning, or not. An issue not to be tried, but by going to trial, upon the particulars in which the change consisteth.

*If the Pope be  
Antichrist and  
the Papists  
Idolaters, the  
Church of  
Rome no true  
Church.*

But are we all content to go to trial upon this issue? It were good that we did understand one another, whether we be agreed upon it or not. For if we be, then may we expect to build *Solomons Temple*, without any noise; If not, we shall be the Builders of *Babel*: We shall never understand one anothers Language. For of a truth, there is another reason alledged for the breach between us and the Church of *Rome*; to-wit, that the Pope is Antichrist, and the Papists Idolaters. If this pretence be true, we need not seek farther for the reason of the distance. We are to own the Separation for our own Act, and to glorie in it. For it is done by Gods express Command; *Come out of her my People*: As to the Jews, in the Captivity of *Babylon*, so to the Christians, in the *Apocalypse*: If it be the Church of *Rome* that *Babylon* there signifieth. But if this plea be good, it may be inconsistent with that which the former plea supposeth. And though we cannot go to trial upon the truth of it, without going to trial upon the particulars in difference; yet it is necessary to provide, that we contradict not our selves. It is necessary also to consider the importance and consequence of it: Whether the reason of the distance amount to so heavy a charge or not. It is necessary, that we understand our selves, whether we admit the consequence of our own supposition or not.

*If no Visible  
Church, then  
no sin of  
Schism.*

And indeed it concerns us to the purpose. We all believe one Catholick Church, for an Article of our Creed, upon which the hope of our Common Salvation hangeth. If any man be allowed to say, I believe it not; I must be allowed to say,

say, I must not be of that Church in which he is allowed to say it. It were good to understand, whether the Unity of the Church, ( out of which no man is saved ) be the Visible Unity of those that communicate in the Offices of Gods Service; Or whether it be enough, that, being invisibly United to Christ, they are invisibly United to one another by Christ. For if the Visible Unity of the Church be not founded by God, then is there no crime of Schism in breaking that Unity; but onely of Heresie, in breaking it upon an error in the Faith. If there be such an Unity: And therefore such a crime in breaking it; care would be had, that we ground not our selves, in this state of Separation, upon that which will render us accessory to it.

Now, I do not doubt, that whosoever hath gone about, or shall go about to perswade the Jews, that he is the Christ whom they expect, must needs, *ipso facto*, be Antichrist. For the word signifies no more than one that pretends to be Christ in opposition to the true Christ. And therefore to Christians who believe in the true Christ, a *false Christ* and an *Antichrist* are both one. And S. John, 1 John II. 18. 22. IV. 3. II John 7. signifies nothing else by that name, but those whom our Saviour calls *false Christs* Mat. XXIV. 24. Mark XIII. 22. And therefore, he that pretendeth to be such a Prophet and a Prince, as the Jews expected that their Christ should be, in opposition to the true Christ in whom Christians believe, as he is a *false Christ*, so is he *Antichrist*. For there is no other mention of *Antichrist* in all the Scriptures, but this. Other Scriptures are onely supposed to speak of *Antichrist*. But presumption, without evidence, must not be taken for truth. I do not doubt then, that *Mahomet* is really *Antichrist*; though the Mahumetans expected no Christ; because he is the Author of a Law, which they take for Gods Law: And of a power founded upon that Imposture: as the Jews expect that their Christ shall restore *Moses* Law, and the power which God first founded upon it. But neither can the Jews Antichrist, nor the Mahumetans Antichrist be Idolaters, without rooting up the *Alcoran*, or the Law of *Moses*; which was not the way to win, either the Jews, or those whome Mahomet had to do with. Notwithstanding, I believe *Manicheus* was Antichrist and an Idolater

*Antichrist may be an Idolater, but cannot be the Head of a Church.*

## Just Weights

both. I believe he taught the Idolatry of the Persians, in his two Gods; the principles, one of good, the other of evil. He pretended, indeed, to come from Christ, as having his Spirit; And therefore sent out his twelve Apostles, as our Lord Christ had sent his. But yet, that he brought in his own new Law instead of Christianity, no man that knows his positions can doubt. And is not he Antichrist, that pretends to do what Christ indeed hath done? Therefore I deny not, that the Pope may be Antichrist, though the Papists be Idolaters. But I do not grant, that the Pope can be Antichrist, granting the Church of *Rome* to be a true Church. For to be a true Church presupposes the profession of so much Christianity, as is necessary to the salvation of all Christians. But the salvation of no Christian can stand with the profession of a false Christ. And therefore, granting the Pope to be Antichrist, they that own him can be no Church. So, this plea will be inconsistent with the former, which supposeth the Church of *Rome* a true Church, when the Separation fell out.

*Though it were  
Idolatry to  
worship the  
Host, yet, to  
kneel at the  
Communion  
would be Holy.*

As for the charge of Idolatry, it is at present alledged in Bar to the Law of this Kingdom, and the effect of it, that the Worship of the Host in the Papacy is Idolatry; therefore we must not receive the Communion kneeling, if we would be commended for breaking the Brazen Serpent, with *Hezekiah*. I say nothing to the consequence, though it were easie enough to say; that the People committed Idolatry to the Brazen Serpent till that very day, *2 Kings XVIII. 4.* And to alledge the Practice of the Catholick Church, who, while there was appearance of offense, did not make use of Idol Temples for Churches: But, when the offense began to cease; as in the time of *Honorius*; common reason obliged them to do it. Let them pursue the consequence of their own reason; that is, let them meet by their own Standard; and then they must pull down all the Churches in the Kingdom. I shall prefer the wisdom of *St. Gregory of Rome*, by whom this Nation received Christianity; ordering the Pagan Festivals of our Ancestors, to be converted to the Assemblies of Christians. For if Christianity sanctifie not all times, places, and gestures, that may pretend, in common reason, to advance the service of God; wherein differeth it from Judaism? For in Judaism, the day,

day, the place, the circumstance prescribed by the Law, sanctified that action to be the service of God, which, it had been abominable to tender God for his service, at another time, or in another place, or otherwise. As rest on the seventh day of the Week, dwelling in a Booth at the feast of Tabernacles, was the service of God, according to the Law of *Moses*. But to pretend to serve God thereby at another time, had been to usurp upon God, and his power which gave the Law. On the contrary, the service of God according to Christianity, sanctifieth all times, all places, all gestures, all circumstances, that can pretend to express, to procure, to advance that attention of mind, that devotion of Spirit, wherewith Christians profess to worship God, in spirit and truth. Otherwise, the Kingdom of God must consist in making a difference of meats and drinks, in despite of *St. Paul*, (And, for the same reason, of times, and places, and gestures) not for unity in the service of God, or increase of devotion, as all reason requireth; but as the Subject matter, wherein the service of God, according to Christianity, consisteth.

But I set aside this consequence; though I could not let it pass without setting this mark upon it. The assumption who will undertake to prove? Who will take upon him to shew us, that the worship of the Host in the Papacy is Idolatry? They who grant the Church of *Rome* to be a true Church, and salvation to be had in it, and by it, may if they see cause, spare contradicting those that take it for granted before it be proved; But they cannot take it for granted themselves. A Church is a company of Christians; and all Christians profess the true Christ: And all that profess the true Christ profess the true God: And, professing the true God, if they believe that which they profess, they cannot honour any creature as they honour God: For they profess that there is only one true God: And that there is infinite distance between him and all creatures; so that they cannot esteem any creature to be God; and therefore they cannot so honour any creature, as if it were God. Christianity supposeth the belief of one true God, and the being of the Church supposeth Christianity. It took away Idolatry, in point of Fact, which Judaism could not do, though it shewed reason enough to take it away. And therefore,

*That which the Church of Rome professeth is no Idolatry, if it be a true Church.*



fore let no man think it easie for a Church, to build up that, (either by expresse Law, or by the silent custom) which the profession upon which it is built destroyeth. Let us be as careful as you please, that Idolatry, which is put out at the great gate of the Church, get in at no back-door of it. The true God of Israel, and our Lord Christ, might be Idols to them that professed not one true God. If they who profess the true Christ can be bred in such ignorance, as not to acknowledge the difference between God and his creature, all their Religion may come to be Idolatry in Gods sight, however the Church be obliged to esteem it. For certainly, some Witches commit Idolatry to the Devil, though there be Witches of all Religions. And so there may be Idolaters of all Religions, supposing that men may act contrary to that which they profess. But that is not the question which we have in hand, when we Dispute whether we are to forsake the Church of *Rome* as Idolaters, or not. For it is the publick profession thereof, that we are to forsake: We are not to forsake it, for the actions of private persons, contrary to that which they publicly profess. Now, they which profess the only true Christ, and therefore, the only true God, do necessarily profess to detest all Idolatry; which, the profession of Christianity effectively rooted out of the World, wheresoever it prevailed. And so doth the Church of *Rome* still as seriously profess, as they who charge them to be Idolaters. And therefore; cannot easily be convinced to profess Idolatry. For, without expressly renouncing this profession, they cannot expressly be Idolaters without renouncing it by such consequence, as may convince common reason that they contradict themselves, and renounce all of them, that which all of them profess, they cannot be Idolaters by consequence. And therefore, it is not easie to make it appear to common reason that they are Idolaters: (And so, that we are to forsake them as Idolaters) because then it must appear to common reason, that so great a part of Christendom doth, by their profession, contradict that which themselves profess.

*They that separate from the Church of Rome as Idolaters are thereby Schismatics before God.*

And what will they that stand upon this plea say to me, who pretend to have proved, that the nature of Idolatry consisteth in that which I have said; and therefore, that the Papists are not, by their common profession, Idolaters? Can they pretend

so



so much charity to me, as to have attempted the answering of my Reasons, and the rectifying of my mistakes? Or will they shew me who hath answered them; and so, that they need not be troubled for me? If they will not be tied to this, would they have the Law of the Land changed; upon a supposition which I have destroyed, and they cannot pretend to have restored? Nay, would they have it changed to no better effect, then to make me, and all that are satisfied with the Reasons which I have advanced, Schismatics in the sight of God, allowing and consenting to the change that shall be made for their sake? This were indeed an incomparable piece of Charity, to purchase peace and unity with them, at the charge of answering for all the mischiefs which our Schism with the Church of *Rome* produceth. For in plain terms, we make our selves Schismatics by grounding our Reformation upon this pretence. For on the one side, we profess the separation to have been our intent not a consequence of the Reformation, by the fault of the Church of *Rome*, in not complying with it. Because we give such a Reason for it, as if it be true, we cannot, without renouncing our Christianity, hold Communion with those whom we charge with it. Whereas Reformation is indeed, and always was the thing intended. Division in the Church, which it hath occasioned, is the crime of those that refuse to come in to it, upon such terms as the common Christianity requireth. On the other side, this cause, which would be more then sufficient to justify Separation, did it appear to be true; charges the mischiefs of the Schism upon those that proceed upon it, before it be as evident as the mischiefs are, which they run into upon it. So that should this Church declare, that the Change which we call Reformation is grounded upon this supposition; I must then acknowledge that we are the Schismatics. For, the cause not appearing to me, (as hitherto it hath not, and I think, will never be made to appear to me) the separation, and the mischiefs of it, must be imputed to them that make the change. And as they who justify the Reformation by charging the Pope to be Antichrist, and the Papists Idolaters; So, on the other side, they who overcharge the Reformation to be Hereticks, make themselves thereby Schismatics before God.

CHAP.

## CHAP. II.

*The supposition of Antichrist and Idolatry prejudicial to the truth. The supposition of one Visible Church the ground of Communion, as well within the Reformation, as in the whole Church. What the Romish Missionaries get by the charge of Heresie, and the pretence of Infallibility. What we get by the charge of Idolatry and Antichrist. Immoderate charges vain on both sides. The charge of Schism on both sides moderate, as to the Church. The sin of Schism, as to God, horrible. The Schism of the Donatists, in charging the Catholicks to be Apostates. The sad Consequences of that Schism.*

*The supposition of Antichrist and Idolatry prejudicial to the truth.*

**F**urther, as I began to say before, supposing for Disputes sake, but not granting for truth, that the Pope is Antichrist and the Papists Idolaters; and that thereupon we are to have no communion with the Church of Rome, are not the particulars to be decided by the same Reasons, (and therefore upon the same terms) as if neither the Pope were Antichrist, nor the Papists Idolaters: For this being clear beyond Dispute, what do we gain by a supposition, so impossible to be set in the light of competent evidence even that which we see is come to pass; an unchristian, rather than an unreasonable apprehension; that, the further we run from them, the neerer we shall come to the truth of Christianity. Whereas, we are to take no less heed, that we run not beyond the Church of God: The Unity where-

whereof, if it be indeed ordained by God, is ordained to no other purpose, than to render the true bounds of Christianity (that is, the means of salvation) visible to all Christians. For, the truth of the particulars in difference stands where it would stand, whether the Pope be Antichrist, and the Papist Idolaters, or not. But, they that believe them so, must needs thereupon incline to believe them further from the truth, then indeed they will appear to be, if it be not true. And therefore must needs have a hand in the Schism, in departing further from them than they ought to do. He that takes the Pope for Antichrist, and the Papists for Idolaters, can never weigh by his own Weights, and mete by his own Measures, till he hate Papists worse than Jews or Mahumetans, who cannot be Idolaters; which some, but few of them profess to do. Is not he, that runs from Rome with this Opinion, in danger to forget the Proverb; *Ita fugias ne prater causam*; and run by the door of Gods Church?

Now, suppose we can have no Communion with the Church of Rome, because it appeareth that the Pope is Antichrist, and the Papist Idolaters; yet ought we to hold Communion with all Christendom besides, that own not Antichrist, nor his Idolatries. I say, if the Visible Unity of the Church appear to be the Ordinance of God; in the next place to holding the truth of Christianity, we shall stand obliged to hold Communion with the rest of the Church. But this Communion cannot be maintained, without an expresse profession, that the Visible Unity of the Church is the expresse will of God, and his Ordinance; though the will of man render it frustrate. This profession it is, that obligeth all to stand to those grounds, and those terms, upon which it is to be maintained; whatsoever differences may arise to render it questionable. And it is the not acknowledging of those grounds, that hath made way for those Divisions, which have succeeded within the Reformation, in several parts of it. For, as they have all proved incurable, for want of this Principle of Unity; so it is not possible that ours, which have come to pass in the last place, should be cured upon any other principle of Christianity, to the salvation of Souls; however the benefit of publick Peace may prevail, to keep them from doing that mischief in the World, which they have done.

*The supposition of one Visible Church the ground of Communion, as well within the Reformation, as in the whole Church.*

C

The

what the Romish Missionaries get by the charge of Hæresie, and the pretense of Infallibility.

The truth is, they of the Church of Rome have overcharged us, in calling us Hæreticks; taking that charge to signifie division upon matter of Faith. But they that would have the Pope Antichrist, and the Papiests Idolaters, have revved it upon them, and taken their Revenge beyond the bounds of blameless defense. For the profession of Idolatry necessarily signifies utter Apostasie from Christianity to Paganism. There is nothing else known by the name of Idolatry in the Scriptures; by which they must prove, if they do prove them Idolaters. For, the Idolatry of the Gnosticks (which, I am confident, is mentioned in divers Texts of the New Testament) may well be accounted the Idolatry of the Pagans, though pretending to be Christians. Because they did not stick to exercise the same Idolatries with the Pagans, when occasion was offered; though they had their own Idolatries besides; whether peculiar to their several Religions, or as Magicians. This is the reason of that which I said before, that we need not dispute, which side is the true Church, if we can prove them Idolaters. But it is to be feared, that the Romish Missionaries do advantage themselves more by the pretense of Hæresie, than they by the pretense of Idolatry, or Antichrist. For, having obtained this great truth, that there is no salvation out of Gods Church: and then, that the Church of Rome is Gods Church; (which, as I said in the beginning, hath always been granted) how easie is it to infer; That there is no salvation, but in Communion with the Church of Rome? For how many of them whom they deal with can distinguish a Church from the Church; or give a Reason how, God having founded one Church, it may nevertheless stand so divided, that salvation may be had on both sides? Which Reason being once over-seen, the Infallibility of the present Church is swallowed up, and all the Decrees of the Council of Trent must down, with the same assurance as the H. Trinity. Nor need you distinguish between Hæresie and Schism, when once the Church shall have pronounced. Thus save they the labour of proving Transubstantiation, Purgatory, Prayers to Saints, Latin Service, the half Communion, and other points of difference; all of them too tough to be overcome. All of them are clearly gained, by the prejudice which men have imposed upon themselves, that the Church which enjoyns them cannot erre. Whereas nothing can

can be more evident than that which I proposed at the beginning; That it cannot be tried which side is the true Church, but by going to trial upon the particulars in difference.

But they who charge the Pope to be Antichrist, and the Papists Idolaters, the higher their charge, the more to do must they have to perswade common reason, that so great a part of Mankind should expect to be saved, by professing to contradict that which themselves profess. And, suppose that a prejudicate zeal can transport a man, to think the wisest people upon earth (those that Govern the See of *Rome*) and all those whom their wisdom carries along, so far out of their wits, as to contradict, by their profession, that which themselves profess. When all this is done, every Text of the Scripture, that cannot be expounded to this supposition, will be a peremptory barr to their pretense. And, how much is there of the *Apocalypse* it self, that is acknowledged not to be fulfilled, as yet, in that sense? How much of the rest of the Scripture, that cannot, without violence, be reconciled to it? And when a Novice, grounded upon this supposition, is forced from his ground, upon Remonstrance of such Reasons; how ready is he to fall into the snare of the Missionaries? Whether or no this be the reason of that which wise men have observed; that the passage from the one extream to the other is more easie and frequent amongst us, than from the mean to the extream; let men of discretion judge. Let not them lead the people by the Nose, to believe that they can prove their Supposition when they cannot; and then expect that it be maintained, by them that own the Church of *Rome* for a true Church; and therefore must contradict themselves if they maintain it.

It is then *Achisophels* Counsel that hath prevailed on both sides. For make the quarrel irreconcilable, and nothing but Conquest must end it. But what joy have they of their expectation, on either side? In all troubles of Christendom since *Luthers* time, what gaping hath there been for the sack of *Rome*, and the downfall of the Pope, upon a Prophecie, ten for one more probably fulfilled, in the sack of *Rome* by the *Goths* and *Vandals*, many hundred years ago? And all the Civil blood, all that abominable desolation in Religion which we have seen, our late Usurper seemeth to have accounted meer godliness, in order to that work, which God had designed him for; as he

*what we get  
by the charge of  
Idolatry and  
Antichrist.*

*Immoderate  
charges vain  
on both sides.*



thought himself inspired to believe. Nay, did not some of the Reformation prick up their ears, and begin to think well of his Christianity, for that works sake? And yet this expectation hath not been more vain, than the deep designs of the See of Rome, to reduce the Reformation to the obedience thereof by Conquest, do now, after a long tryal, appear desperate for the future. Now, if the parties be willing to abate of their charge, as they have reason to do, there is a way for both to come off with credit. For the charge of Hæresie naturally shrinks into the Measure of Schism, whensoever they shall be pleased to explain themselves. And they seem to do it; at least as many of them, as now insist upon the charge of Schism. Let our people follow their example, and extend the Idolatry they charge them with to all Superstition; and I will undertake to find them Idolaters in all Professions; namely, all those that commit Idolatry to their own Imaginations.

*The charge of Schism on both sides, moderate, as to the Church.*

As for the mutual imputation of Schism, it is a civil and a moderate challenge, in comparison of those. For Schism is nothing but civil War in the Church. And in civil Wars, as in all Wars, though it be rather impossible than difficult, to name a War that shall be just on both sides; yet it is easie to find a War that is unjust on both sides. St. Augustine commends the saying of one in his time, that declaimed upon the Rape of *Lucrece*; *Mira res*, said he, *duo fuerunt & Adulterium unus commisit*; A strange thing, that a man lying with a woman, only the one should commit Adultery. I will not compare War with Adultery; which carries sin in the name of it. For I will not say that all War is sin. But he that can look upon the mischiefs, either of civil War in the World, or of Schism in the Church, with the heart of a Christian, will not think strange that both sides should be Schismatics to God, though only one part can be Schismatics to the Church. For when the cause may be visibly decided (as in the Schism of the Donatists) then the one side are Schismatics, the other is the Church. But when it cannot, (as perhaps it will prove, between the Reformation and the Church of Rome) then if the blame of the Schism fall on both sides, both sides shall be Schismatics to God; neither to the Church.

But.

But, though I make it a moderate charge, as to the Church, when one side challenges the other to be Schismatics; yet, as to God, the sin of Schism is of an horrible tincture. For an Hæretick, or an Apostate, in the sight of God, destroys only his own soul. But he that causeth division in the Church, either peremptorily destroys, or probably hinders the salvation of all that are parties to it. So the Authors of Schism must answer for all the souls that perish by it. How the means of salvation depend upon the Unity of the Church; is a thing that must appear, by proving that God hath ordained it for that purpose. But if so it prove, then may every man see, how heavy a charge the crime of Schism will prove in Gods sight. The mischief of Hæresie will lie in the Schism which it involveth, when Division falls out upon a point of Faith. Now, breach of charity, in hindring the salvation of all that divide, is abundantly enough to destroy salvation; though more than enough, if upon a point of Faith, which is Hæresie to the Church.

*The sin of Schism, as to God, horrible.*

But he that would consider first, how much the excessive charges on both sides contribute to the Division of the Church; then, how much the Division of the Church to the ruine of Christianity: Let him compare our present Divisions with the Schism of the Donatists; the case whereof is thus to be stated: It was pretended, that *Cacilianus* was made Bishop of *Carthage*, by Traytors and Apostates. For, those that were called *Traditores*, for delivering the Scriptures, and other Utensils of Gods service, to their persecutors for present safety, they accounted no less than Apostates, for betraying the common Christianity. And that upon this Account. If *Eleazen*, and the *Maccabees* had redeemed their lives, by eating Swines Flesh; their crime had not been the bare breach of that Precept; it had been Apostasie; because done at the instance of him that pressed him to forsake the Law. So, the Crime of those that delivered such goods to Persecutors, they justly took to be the Crime of Apostasie, as done at the instance of Persecutors, that pressed all to depart from Christianity. And, when the rest of the Church did acknowledge *Cacilianus*, and communicate with him as Bishop of *Carthage*, then did they openly forsake the whole Church, as guilty of the same Apostasie, for communicating with Apostates, and rejecting them, because they rejected Apostates. And had

*The Schism of the Donatists in charging the Catholics to be Apostates.*



had they not reason on their side, if the Church of *Africk*, under *Cacilianus*, had been really Apostates? Admitting the Visible Unity of the Church, it is not to be avoided. For this Unity must be founded upon supposition of Christianity. If Christianity be evidently renounced, they who acknowledge manifest Apostates members of Gods own Church, must be accounted Apostates themselves, by them that would indeed be members of it. But there was great difference between professed Apostasie, and the crime of those, who, dissembling their Christianity to save their lives, had been permitted to hold their degrees in the Church; professing it as well as the best when the danger was past. For, though the Rule of the Church allowed not that they should hold their degrees in the Church; yet it was found necessary to abate of the Rule, that Unity (for which the Rule was provided) might be preserved. And, being allowed to hold their degrees in the Church for that reason, there was difference enough between them and Apostates. All this supposing the matter of Fact; that those who ordained *Cacilianus* were indeed such as had given up such goods; which, if it were true, never appeared to the Church to be true. Whereas they who began the Schism, by ordaining another Bishop of *Carthage* against him; were divers ways convicted to be such themselves.

The sad consequences of this Schism.

But it is strange to consider, how the Donatists abhorred the Catholics, meerly upon this supposition, without any other occasion of difference, either in Faith, or in the Rites and Customs of the Church. For it is the ground why they rebaptized all those whom they seduced from the Catholick Church; as baptized by Apostates. Whereas the Catholics, taking them for Schismatics, as they were, sought only to win them upon such terms, as the reconciling of Schismatics to the Church requires. But it is hard to relate the slanders, the murders, the violences, the mischiefs, which this Division brought forth; and that, so far as I can understand, till Christianity was utterly destroyed in *Africk*, by the Mahometans.

C H A P.

## C H A P. III.

*They that hold by One Visible Church are to own the consequences of it. Nothing to be changed, but upon that ground. We cannot be the same Church with that which was, otherwise. Though that which shall be settled will find Advocates. Civil Laws of Religion to be changed, till this Rule be attained. The beginning and rise of our differences. The present state of them. What terms of agreement, with the Presbyterians, we ought to allow. The Laws of the Primitive Church the Standard of all change. Our present Case is not the Case of our Forefathers. The Acts of Henry the Eighth, no Acts of our Forefathers in Religion. Imperfection of Laws, in Religion, no imputation to our Forefathers. The pretense of tender Consciences is no Rule. It serves Papists, as well as Puritans.*

**A**LL this while, you see, I take it not for granted, that it is *They that hold by One Visible Church are to own the consequences of it.* one Visible Church which our Creed professeth. But I say, those who take it for granted, and admit not the due consequence of it, are they that weigh not by their own Weights, nor mete by their own Measures; but keep a Weight and a Weight, a Measure and a Measure; which must needs be a thing accursed, because they cannot both be the Weights and Measures.

tures of the Sanctuary. The order of Bishops, and the right of the Church goods have both recovered their possessions, by the Law of this Land. In both these points, the Law of this Land acknowledgeth the authority of the whole Church of Christ; the evidence whereof is indisputable in both Titles. They that are not content to go by the same Weight and Measure, both with Papists and Puritans, in all other matters, they must answer God, for weighing and measuring by their own Weights and Measures in other things, weighing and measuring by his Weights and Measures in these.

*Nothing to be  
changed, but upon  
that ground.*

The rest of our differences seem to consist in two points; the one, concerning the Covenant of Grace, and the dependences of it, seems to be of great consequence to the substance of Christianity. The other must comprehend all the noise that is made, of Ceremonies, and Forms of Praying, and Power of Discipline, and in fine, all that is questioned concerning the Laws of this Church. These are Punctillio's indeed; one by one, but all together they make a great sum. And, take them one by one, it is considerable, that the changing of any one is the changing of a Law of this Kingdom. But if the change should be made, without providing for the substance of our Christianity, in that which is notoriously questionable amongst us; then must we think of a new Answer to the Papists demand, where was your Church before *Luthers* time? And in all cases, if the Laws of our Church be changed for Peace sake, without regard to that truth, which made it Reformation to change the Laws of the Church of *Rome*; may it not become questionable, whether the Church of *England* remain the Church of *England*, or not? For I am well assured, that there is so much in question amongst us, as, if it were decided for the Puritans, would cast the advantage on the Papists side. And therefore, they who believe no salvation out of Gods Church, are to change nothing for other reasons, than such as the Visible Unity of it may justify, in case it appear to be founded by God.

*We cannot be  
the same Church  
with that  
which was,  
otherwise.*

For that Principle, as it is evidence in matters of Faith questionable amongst us; so it is the Standard in matter of Church Law, to measure the distance between the true point of Reformation, and the present Church of *Rome*, by that which is visible in the Catholick Church; allowing for that difference, which

which the change of time may have brought forth. They that find themselves bound by this principle, to be visibly one and the same Church with the Catholick, will find it easie to imp and to ingraff the Faith and Laws of this Church, into the Original and Catholick Faith and Laws of Gods whole Church, by this Rule; But impossible to make us visibly the same Church with it upon other Terms.

I do no ways doubt, that, though a change should be made for the worse, (which God forbid) there would be found men to maintain it. For the Laws of Kingdoms and Commonwealths are of great force to frame the opinions and manners of particular persons: And that in matter of Religion, in this Estate, where Christianity is settled by the Laws of Sovereignities. And the Church goods, which are now recovered out of the hands of Usurpers, must then be the reward of those, that shall have most to say for the Laws that shall be made. And therefore, while we are upon this plea for our selves, against the Church of *Rome*; I find it no unreasonable freedom that I take, to set forth the consequence of it, in the change that is or may be pretended.

*Though that which shall be settled will find Advocates.*

I know it is a Maxim necessary to the quiet of all States that Laws are not to be changed, for hope of amendment. But it is no less necessary to enter an exception to it, for those Laws, by which the Reformation is to be settled, in several Sovereignties of Christendom. For if the Visible Unity of the Church be Gods Ordinance, then they ought all to have been made, of necessity, ambulatory, as provisions only for the time; and not to be taken for settled, till all had been agreed upon a Rule, whereby Communion might be maintained amongst them all, whatsoever differences might fall out any where. And I am well assured, that they could never have attained any such Provision, without supposing the Visible Unity of the whole Church; the grounds and consequences of which Supposition, being taken for Gods Ordinance, first brought it to pass. And having attained it, I am well persuaded, that the breach between the Reformation and the Church of *Rome* could not have subsisted. Now, that several Sovereignties have made their several changes, without communicating with one another; (that is, as not tyed to the Visible Unity of the

*Civil Laws of Religion to be changed, till this Rule be attained.*

D

Whole)

Whole) it is become infinitely more difficult to unite them without expressly agreeing in this principle; then it would be to unite all, agreeing in it. For the grounds and consequence of it would be, necessarily, the Scale to Ballance, and the Standard to measure all differences.

The beginning  
and rise of our  
differences.

They who, for the present, are not divided about Religion as we are, may perhaps think these considerations too far fetched to trouble themselves with. We that cannot make up the present breaches without new provisions, are only to advise, whether we will trust God, and our Lord Christ, with the success, weighing by our own Weights, and meting by our own Measures. For our case is evidently this. The Reformation under *Edward VI.* raised a party against it, not as preferring *Luther* before *Calvin*, but as preferring Unity with the Catholic Church, before difference from the present Church of *Rome*. The Relation of the troubles at *Francford*, published by the Puritans, shews, that they were as much divided about obedience to their Sovereign, persecuting the Reformation which they professed, as about obedience to their Bishops, and the power of erecting Churches of themselves. When the Bull of *Pius V.* against Queen *Elizabeth* came forth, the Papists, who from the beginning of her Reign, had outwardly conformed to the exercise of Religion established by her Laws, withdrawing themselves, in obedience to the Bull; got thereby the name of *Recusants*. About the same time, they that rested not content with the Reformation established, appearing in a party, got themselves the name of *Puritans*. Whereby it appeareth, that the Jealousie of the State upon the other party, together with the hatred of the People against it, for the persecutions under Queen *Mary*, gave them boldness and opportunity to shew themselves, and success to make them considerable. That abatement of the Form settled under *Edward VI.* which, to content them, had been made under Queen *Elizabeth*, gave them appetite to demand more. The Recusants in the mean time, as consenting to the attempts that were made against the person of the Sovereign, and the State, by virtue of that Bull; (because in matter of Religion, they all gave obedience to it) were involved in such penalties, as the severity of the Laws, occasioned by the hainousness of those attempts, provided.

Thus



*The present  
state of them.*

Thus passed the time on, till the same appetite, animated by the Credit of the late Parliament, helped the pretenses thereof for reforming the Government, to set three Kingdoms, upon pretense of Religion also, on the Fire of one Civil Warr. For the Irish Rebellion, which the example of the Scottish Commotion had brought forth, falling in with the one party (though not so heartily, as the new Insurrection of Scotland with the other) made the breach wider, by uniting all into two parties. The quarrel being decided, they who pretended no more for the War, but Episcopacy, Liturgy, and the Ceremonies, brought in a new confession of Faith, and new Catechisms, as well as a Directory, and an Ordinance for Church-Government. The sword, that had decided the quarrel, it seems, was to make good the difference, without pleading the Word for the trial of it. In the mean time, I will not say that those damnable Doctrines, preached by the Sects which the War had brought forth, are the necessary consequences of the Doctrine brought in of new: And of the difference between it and that which was before. But this I will say, that there is no Visible difference between the *Presbyterians* and the *Phanaticks*; these sheltering themselves under the quality of those, whensoever the Law forbids their peculiar Assemblies. And I say farther, that, if there be such a thing as a Catholick Church, all the Phrensies of the Phanaticks are justly imputable to those that distinguish not themselves from Phanaticks; but admit them to their Communion as Phanaticks. Upon this account I use the name of Puritans, though seeming a term of disgrace, to comprise all the Sects, into which, that once common name hath since been divided. For I use also the name of Papists not intending any disgrace by it, though first taken up in that sense; because it seemeth, that use hath rendred that sense insensible.

Hence it may appear, why it is not to be said, that the Papists standing stiff in maintaining all the abuses, which, we are called Protestants for protesting against; it will not be for the honour of the Reformation, to own any imperfection in it: It will occasion weak Souls to fall away to the Church of Rome. For supposing him a Christian that objects this, I would ask him, in the first place: Whether it be not more for

*what terms of  
agreement  
with the Pres-  
byterians we  
ought to allow.*



the purpose of a Christian, to have a plea that will bear him out at the great day of Judgment, than to have a plea that may advantage his party here? Whether he and I can agree upon any better Plea, for the Change which we call Reformation, and our adhering to it, then their evident rigour, in maintaining their evident abuses; That they admit no terms of peace and reconciliation, but those upon which they united their own party against us, at the Council of *Trent*? And would he have us to imitate them here, in that which we mean to plead against them, at the day of Judgment? For if there be such a thing as a Visible Church, then ought the Church of *Rome* to condescend to such terms as may restore Unity; preserving and improving, as much as may be, the Common Christianity. It is the best Plea that we shall have for our selves at the Day of Judgment, why we continue divided from them; that they give us no appearance of hope, that they will condescend to any such terms. And therefore we ought to condescend to terms of Agreement, in such matters as we have in dispute, with our Brethren the Presbyterians. But not such terms as Faction and Prejudice imagineth, but such as the Common Christianity, and the Original Unity of Gods Church determineth. For if we use that Rigour which we charge the Church of *Rome* with, we weigh not by our own Weights, nor mete by our own Measures. But if we stand not upon that with them, upon which we defend our selves against the Church of *Rome*; Again we weigh not by our own Weights, or mete by our own Measures.

*The Laws of  
the Primitive  
Church the  
Standard of all  
change.*

And indeed, supposing that the reconciling of them to this Church will require a Law of the Kingdom, that may authorize them in their Ministries; What appearance is there of hope, that the Laws which they have broken from by the Schism, will serve to bring them back? What appearance is there of despair, that the Laws of the Primitive Church will not serve; with that allowance, which the change of times and the difference of the case may require? Such a change would reconcile them, and not as Presbyterians. Such a change would clear us from all Imputation of Schism, with the Church of *Rome*. Such a change would produce that Improvement in Christianity, which the name of Reformati-  
on

on pretendeth. The Church of *Rome* would have no cause to laugh at such a Change ; Unless they would laugh for joy, at that Improvement of the common Christianity, which they themselves would presently stand obliged to imitate. They themselves, who would be accounted Infallible, were glad to provide for Unity among themselves, by new Decrees, at the Council of *Trent*. Those that think they may fail, and know, that all positive Laws, saving the Gospel, which our Lord Christ came in person to preach, (for that also, may, in some respect, be accounted Positive ) are subject to that Imperfection, which the change of time either produceth or discovereth, or to think it no reproach to change for the better, when the necessity of reconciling a Schism requireth it. Let Papists glean-up here and there a weak Profelyte ; (such for the most part, as little troubled in Conscience with the matter of difference, seek onely what to palliate their Interest with) Who can propose a general good, without danger of particular offence ? It was a divine saying of an Heathen ; that the good cause passes from that side that refuses reason, to that side that proffers it.

Again, shall we charge them at the day of Judgment, for *Our present* adhering to Custom against Truth ; to their Forefathers, *Case is not the* against that which was from the beginning ; and adhere our *Case of our* selves to that, wherein, we cannot say that our Forefathers *Forefathers.* have restored it ? Certainly, if we will weigh by our own Weights, and mete by our own Measures, we are not to engage with our Forefathers against the Catholick Church, if we suppose it Gods Ordinance. For their Case is not our Case: now the Case is put, that Unity in Religion cannot be had without a new Law of the Kingdom. The Council of *Trent* hath succeeded since the Reformation which they made. If it be the second blow that makes the quarrel, it is not the Reformation, but the Council of *Trent*, that hath formed the Schism between us and the Church of *Rome*. The publishing of it is the declaring of a Law, upon admitting whereof, we may communicate with the Church of *Rome* ; otherwise not. And so on our side, the settling of Religion by a new Law of the Kingdom will be a Declaration, that we will have no peace, without so much more, then our Reformation hitherto hath demanded.

demanded. For if the Unity of the Church be Gods Ordinance, it is not in the power of any part of it, to unite themselves upon those Conditions, which they ought not to stand upon with the rest of the Church, if they could not be reunited to it, without such conditions. So they may be no Schismatics in Gods sight, for changing without the Church of *Rome*, which they knew would not consent to the change; and yet we may be Schismatics, in defying it upon new terms of distance.

*The Acts of  
Henry VIII.  
no Acts of our  
Forefathers in  
Religion.*

When I speak of our Forefathers, I accompt not the Acts of *Henry VIII.* the Acts of our Forefathers, in matter of Religion. For it is manifest, that he left not the See of *Rome*, upon any pretence of reforming Religion; further then the removing of that power, which indeed hindred it; nor as hindring it, but as burthensom in his own case. If any beginnings of the Reformation were brought in upon this occasion, during his time, we have reason to own the things done, without disputing the reason for which they were done. Otherwise we are not engaged to his proceedings, because they made way for the Reformation to succeed. They who declaim against the persecutions raised by the Church of *Rome*, as they deserve; (while the bloody Law of the six Articles, and the persecuting of the Popes authority at the same time, is buried in silence;) do not weigh by their own *Weights*, nor mete by their own *Measures*. The pretense of Reformation under *Edward VI.* excuses much defect in the form of proceeding, by the matter which it introduced. They might make use of that which had been done to another intent. We are not to measure their Actions, by the Actions of them which were guided by other reasons.

*Imperfection of  
Laws in Religion,  
no imputation to our  
Forefathers.*

In fine, to maintain other mens Actions, is to make our selves accessory to their sins in doing them. The Church of *Rome*, standing to that which they received from their Forefathers, stand but to that corruption, to which, that State of Religion which the Apostles brought in, hath degenerated by tract of time. That our Forefathers should not at once see, or seeing should not at once be able to restore all that was decayed, is no Imputation to men not pretending infallibility. Why they have not since proceeded to restore the rest, I have shewed evident reason, in the contrary Factions of Papists and Puritans, and the effects

effects of them, which our times have seen. They themselves profess an imperfection, in not restoring of Penance; a matter of such consequence, that all the Judgments of God, which we have suffered, may justly be imputed to it. And therefore, the necessity of this time requiring a change, the introducing of that which never was, for the contenting of men, instead of restoring that which was, and therefore ought to be, will be the sin of the Nation; the declaring of this, will be the discharge of him that is so perswaded.

As for the plea of tender Consciences, to him that considers our Case, in which it is made, it will easily appear to be a Saddle for all Horses; a pair of Stirrups, to be lengthned or shortened to all Statures. For we are tyed to this Supposition; the Law is to be re-established, according to which God must be served by the Church of England, for the future. And to pretend tenderness of Conscience against the Law of the Church and Kingdom, is to proclaim disobedience to all Laws, that are not made by them who alledge it. For for why may not any Law meet with tender Consciences, if some do? And tenderness of Conscience is a thing invisible, which no Law can take for granted on any side. But supposing the Unity of the Church ordained by God; to forbear those Laws which it requireth, because tenderness of Conscience may be alledged against them, is to offend the whole rather than a part. For the same might have been alledged against any Law of Gods Church. So there could have been no such thing as a Visible Church, if that plea could have served mens turns.

And why should not a Papist have a tender Conscience, as well as a Puritan? Why should not the one expect to be free from the penalties, which the Laws assign to those that refuse them, as well as the other, to have right to the rewards, which they assign to those that embrace them; both professing the same reason, though the one only makes a noise with pleading it? If it be said, that English Papists are not considerable, in comparison with English Puritans; it is to be considered, how great a part of Christendom is engaged in the cause of English Papists; how small a part of the Reformation is engaged in the cause of English Puritans. In the mean time, it is the Papists that are under the penalties of the Laws; Which, Puritans are scandalized, that they

*The pretense of  
tender Consciences is no  
Rule.*

*It serves Pa-  
pists, as well  
as Puritans.*

they may not make. And certainly, no man can truly have a tender conscience in this Case, but he who, for his part, labours that neither Papists may have cause to continue Papists, nor Puritans to continue Puritans. But the conscience of the Kingdom, that is, our hope of Gods blessing, or our fear of his vengeance, will be concerned to the life in it.

## CHAP. IV.

*Eraſtians can acknowledge no Viſible Church founded by God. Their Opinion inableth Sovereigns to persecute Gods truth by Gods Law. Persecuting the truth is the use of a Power which no Sovereign can have. If any Sovereign may punish for the Religion which he professeth, then are Subjects bound to renounce Christ, if the Sovereign command it. No offence, but charity, in declaring the true ground of reconciliation, or punishment. Why it ought to be declared. The declaring of it no offence to Superiours.*

*Eraſtians can  
acknowledge no  
Viſible Church  
founded by God.*

**T**Hat which hath been said of *Henry VIII.* and his Acts, sheweth, that Acts of Parliament cannot be the Measure of Religion, though they should be the Fence and the Bulwark of it. Let me now, upon this occasion, conjure our Brethren the Presbyterians, to lay to heart the unknown danger which this time threatneth, the evident mischief which it produceth. It was a complaint visible in the late Usurpers time; that, while one side was for this Religion, another for that, they that were for no Religion would prove the strongest side. Presbyterians contest with their Prelates, who shall give Law to the Church; that



that is, who shall be the Church. They are desirous to have authority in point of Fact, without and against their Prelates, which they will never make out any title to in point of right, but from their Prelates. They believe, all the while, that the Church is founded by God: and all the rights upon which it is founded, of Divine Right; and yet can find in their hearts to stand wrangling out the time, while they grow the greatest party, that would have no Church at all, and by consequence, no Christianity. We call them *Erasmians*, because the disputes of our times have made it evident; that, if no Excommunication, as he pretended, then no Church. Yet it is not to be granted, that he ever saw through the consequences of his own Position; or would have held no Excommunication, had he thought it would infer no Church. I will not say the Learned *Selden* saw not the consequence. For why should I speak of the Opinion of a man, that was too wise to declare it? I am sure he mistook the state of the Question, when, beginning to declare his Opinion in point of Excommunication, (for he never argued for any part of his Opinion, till he published his Books *de Synedrjs*) he defined Excommunication to be a censure inferring a civil penalty. For it was evident, that all his Adversaries, deriving the power of Excommunication from the Apostles, must deny any civil effect of Excommunication; which they knew it could not have before *Constantine*.

This opinion is liable to an Objection visible enough. For if it were true, then all Subjects, all private Christians, would stand bound in Conscience, to profess that Religion which the Sovereign power enacteth, by the Laws which it giveth. Which if it were so, in vain do we Dispute, whether the Papists, the Prelatick, or the Puritans be in the right. Whatsoever Religion the Law of the Land shall establish, shall be that which God enjoyneth. And the Sovereign shall be able in point of conscience to punish those that refuse it, whether right or wrong; though it cannot be denied, that, as Christendom is at present divided, some Subjects must needs be punished for the right. I know but one that hath looked this objection in the face. His first Answer was, that they that are punished for the right Religion shall be gainers by their sufferings; they shall have their share in the reward of *Martyrs*. This is the Answer that *Julian* the Apostate made the

*Their Opinion enableth Sovereigns to persecute Gods truth by Gods Law.*

E

Christians,



Christians, complaining of their sufferings under him. Therefore it is evident, that a Christian must not alledge it. For, if he that suffers shall have a *Martyrs* reward, what reward shall he that punisheth have, but a Persecutors? So, a Christian Sovereign, for using the power that God gives him, shall have a Persecutors reward.

*Persecuting the Truth is the use of a Power, which no Sovereign can have.*

If it be said, No marvel. Because he uses it amiss, not because he goes beyond the bounds of it; either God hath enacted the contrary of that which the Sovereign enjoyneth, or not. If not, then is that which the Sovereign enjoyneth contrary to no Law of God. And therefore it obligeth the Subject. If so, then cannot the Sovereign Power enjoyn it. And therefore it is extended beyond the bounds of it, in that case. Again, either abusing his power, by enacting that Religion which he ought not, he obligeth his Subject in conscience to God, to profess, and to exercise the Religion, which he enacteth, or not. If not, then must the Subject, for the security of his Conscience, be Judge whether the Sovereign abuse his power or not. If so, then, as before, we dispute about Religion to no purpose; for every man is bound to that which the Law of his Country enacteth. Nay, there will be no reason why Christians, under the Turk, shall not live as Mahumetans. For the quality of a Christian is one and the same, in the Subject, as in the Sovereign. And therefore there can appear no reason, why it should give the one the right, by the Act of his Will to oblige the will of the other; which an undoubted Sovereign, a Pagan, or a Mahumetan hath not. And indeed he hath answered otherwise since. Namely, That a man is bound to renounce Christ with his mouth, if the Sovereign command it; for he shall be saved by believing in him with the heart the same time, which is all that his Christianity requireth. This Answer is plain English. But it comes to this point, That a Christian is saved by the inward act of Faith, without the outward; by believing, without professing.

*If any Sovereign may punish for the Religion which he professeth, then are Subjects bound to renounce Christ, if the Sovereign command it.*

There is another that intended, it seems, to shew the late Usurper, by what right he might protect both Presbyteries and Congregations, dealing with others according to his Interest. He supposeth that a Christian, being justified by his Faith, is at his choice to make himself the member, either of an Independent Congregation, or of one that shall associate it self into a Presby-

Presbytery with others. Whereupon the Sovereign, supposing both of them to be the *Godly party*, must needs find himself bound to protect them both. He saith not by what right he could punish those for their Religion, whom he took not for the *Godly party*; by what right he could hinder them in the free profession and exercise of their Religion, which indeed is a greater punishment than a Christian, neither Heretick nor Schismatick, can be bound to endure. But he need not tell him, by what right he could exclude them from belonging to the *Godly party*. Those whose Religion cannot stand with Usurpation, cannot seem *godly* to Usurpers. In the mean time, as you see, this Author stands upon the same ground with his fellow; that a Christian is justified by the inward act of Faith without the outward, by believing without professing. Only he saith, by believing before he profess; the other, though he profess the contrary of that which he believeth. But neither of both hath offered to say, either that the will of the Sovereign is, by Gods Law, the Rule of Religion to the will of the Subject, which he is to answer God by at the day of Judgment; or that Gods Law can allow the Sovereign to punish the Subject for that Religion, which it enableth not the Sovereign to oblige his Subject to profess. All must come to this point, That a Christian is bound to renounce Christ, if his Sovereign command it. For if a Christian be bound in conscience to obey whatsoever his Sovereign commandeth, in point of Religion; then, if the Great Turk commands his Subjects to renounce Christ, they are bound to obey it. Which whether it be not a position for Machiavelian Atheists, that make no more of Christianity, than of an expedient to Govern people in peace; I leave to all that are capable to judge. Thus much for certain, he that thinks himself tyed to renounce his Christianity, if his Sovereign command him, is no longer a Christian; as having recalled the Vow of his Baptism, to profess Christ until death. And this is that which I conjure our Brethren the Presbyterians to lay to heart; That the visible growth of this Opinion, by their continuing this distance upon trifles, threatens to render them, that would have no Religion at all, the strongest side.

In this open and stiff opposition of four Religions, though not distinguished into four Communions; *Recusants, Prelaricks,*

*No offence, but charity, in declaring the true ground of reconciliation, or punishment.*

*Puritans,*

*Puritans, and Erastians*; (for I oversee the *Fanatics*, as swallowed back into the belly of the *Presbyterians*) shall it be a crime, shall it be an offence for me to say, what point of Christianity, in my poor opinion, reconciles all to unity, that admit Gods Truth? That believing two Articles of our Creed, *One Catholick and Apostolick Church, and one Baptism for remission of sins*; if we believe that they signifie any thing, we are all bound to submit all partialities, to that which they signifie. Not as if *Recusants*, depending upon a Forain communion, and the head of it, that shews no inclination to Unity, upon terms of Gods truth, were likely to take notice of one mans poor opinion, concerning the consequences of common principles. But because we are our selves so far chargable to God, for our Schism with the Church of *Rome*, and the mischiefs of it, as we neglect those consequences: And, because the Justice of the Kingdom, in the penaltries of all Recusancy, may easily be rendred visible, if we keep close to them; but not possibly otherwise. As for those that make the Pope Antichrist, and the Papists Idolaters; can they be allowed to forejudge my opinion, because it makes our Reconcilement with the Church of *Rome* easier than they would have it? For if division in the Church, without evident and valuable cause, be a sin to God; it will certainly be the sin of the Kingdom, to bear them out in it, by stating our Reformation upon undue grounds. For the terms of it must needs be according to the grounds of it; which being either invisible, or inconsiderable in comparison of the benefits of Unity, must needs translate some part of the blame to rest upon that side which exceeds.

why it ought to  
be declared.

And therefore, to excuse my freedom, in publishing that which follows, let no man grudge me this Plea for my self at the day of Judgment; that being convicted, that our agreement cannot be acceptable to God, but upon the consequence of these two suppositions, according to that which follows; I am not at rest till I have said it. Could there be peace had, by compounding the Interest of two parties, without providing for the Interest of our common Christianity, in those two Articles; what joy could a Christian expect, of that which should be purchased at so unconscionable a Rate? Here is nothing said, but that which hath been said, when Arbitrary power might have made.

made it a pretence for Persecution, had the Interest of Usurpers allowed it. It is a short view of that which I have published heretofore, presented to those that may desire to see, in one prospect, what is the true consequence of it, in the composing of those differences, that remain still on foot. And the danger of being involved in the crime of Schism before God, obligeth me to declare that opinion, which being not declared, may render me liable to that charge in Gods sight.

Therefore there is no offence to Superiours in declaring it. The Laws of Kingdoms go by a Rule, that is made of such metal as may bend, and be fitted to the body which they are to rule. Only they are to aim at an inflexible Rule of Gods truth, which is the Inheritance of every Christian. And therefore, he that sees it made crooked, is bound to set it straight. This is not to say, what publick Authority should do; but what it should intend to do. A thing necessary to be said, when there be those, who would have it intend that which it ought not to do. In fine, the difficulty and danger of our case seems to supersede, for the present, the Rule of Obedience in the Church.

*The declaring of it no offence to Superiours.*

## CHAP. V.

*We have the same evidence for the Visible Unity of the Church, as for the Truth of the Scriptures. The Church founded upon the Power of the Keys. The Unity of the Church Visible by the Laws of it. The Law which endoweth the Church with Consecrated Goods. How the Unity of the Church is signified by the Scriptures. How in the Old Testament.*

*we have the same evidence for the Visible unity of the*

**I** Say then, that the Unity of the Church signifies nothing, unless it signifie the Visible Unity of Communion, in the outward

*Church, as for the truth of the Scriptures.*

outward offices of Gods Service; not only the Invisible Unity of the heart, in Faith and Charity: Unless the Church be founded by God for an outward Society, Visible to the common reason of man; not only for an Invisible Number, the Unity whereof only his own Invisible Wisdom inwardly designeth. And I say it, because I conceive I have proved it by the same evidence, upon which we accept the Scriptures for the Word of God: Upon which we hold our common Christianity. For I have shewed, that we believe the Scriptures for the Scriptures; the matter of Faith for the Motives of Faith, there related. That is, we hold those things which the Scriptures relate, sufficient to oblige all the People of God afore Christ to be Jews; all the People of the World after Christ to be Christians. This, in the nature of a reason obliging a man to be a Christian. For in the nature and kind of an effective cause, I do not suppose, much less grant, that any thing is sufficient, much less effectual, without Gods Spirit. But if an Unbeliever should ask me, Why I believe that to be true, which, being true, I grant sufficient to oblige me to believe? It will not serve my turn to say, that I find it written in the Scripture; so long as the Question is, why I believe the Scripture? My Answer must be, That the consent of all Christians, in submitting to the Gospel, (which they would not have done, had they not known the Motives to be true, for which they did it) assures me as much, that they are true, as if I had seen the things done, which moved them to believe. Especially, being as much convicted by the light of Reason and Nature, that Christianity goes beyond Judaism, for advancing the Service of God and Goodness; as that Judaism goes beyond the Religion either of Pagans or Mahumetans.

For this being the reason why we believe, that must be alledged, by all that will alledge any reason to Unbelievers; it must needs have the same force in evidencing the sense, that we allow it in evidencing the credit of the Scriptures. If the consent of all Christians, in submitting to Christianity upon Motives recorded in the Scriptures, assure me that they are true; and therefore the Scriptures the Word of God, and Christianity the only Religion by which we can be saved; then the consent of all Christians, in owning the obligation of holding

Visible

*The Church  
founded upon  
the Power of  
the Keys.*



Visible Communion with the Church, is to assure me that it is Gods Ordinance. For the act, or acts of our Lord, upon which the Church is founded, I alledge the Power of the Keys, described by the effect of *binding and loosing*; and to that effect granted to St. Peter, *Matt. XVI. 18, 19.* To the Disciples assembled after the Resurrection, *John XX. 19 — 23.* in the terms of *remitting and retaining sin*: To the Church, *Matt. XVIII. 15 — 18.* in the same terms as to St. Peter; to the effect of rendring him that obeys not, a *Heathen man* or a *Publican*, to him that would be a Christian. Here you have a certain Power, deposited with certain Persons, the effect whereof is Visible, in the succession of Persons, deriving the Authority which they claim, from the visible act of those Persons which are here trusted with it: And in the maintenance of Visible Communion amongst true Christians, by excluding the false. It is true, Hereticks and Schismaticks exclude themselves out of the Church. For they would be the Church themselves, if they could tell how. But it is the Authority of the Church that obligeth Christians to avoid them, as the Jews, to whom our Lord spake, did then avoid *Heathen men and Publicans.* And it obligeth, by declaring them Hereticks and Schismaticks. I know there be those, that would have the imputation of Heresie and Schism to be now meer Bug-bears, to fright Children with. But would any of them own any of the Sects, which were shut out of the Church for Hereticks or Schismaticks, from the time of our Lord till the time of *Constantine*, for true Christians? Whether they would or they would not, is not considerable. For if all good Christians then did, then did all good Christians own the Visible Unity of the Church. And there is as great a consent of Christians in the Visible Unity of the Church, as in the truth of Christianity, saving this difference; That all Christians, good and bad, true and false, agree in the truth of Christianity; only those that are neither Hereticks nor Schismaticks in the Unity of the Church.

Let no man mistake this evidence, as if so greath a Truth were read only in two or three Texts of Scripture. They who take upon them to argue of such matters as these, ought to know, that the Laws of all Commonwealths, when first they are founded, are the wills of their Rulers, according to that

*The unity of  
the Church  
Visible by the  
Laws of it.*



that measure of Power whereby they Rule. Therefore, if our Lord trust his Disciples, and their Successors, with the Rule of his Church, he trusts them also to make Laws for the Ruling of it; Provided that they tend to enforce, not to avoid those Laws, which he in person hath left them as Christians. For Disciples, that is, Christians, he left them actually; not actually Members of his Church, as not yet actually formed, though virtually founded in the Power of the Keys which he left his Disciples. These Laws are as Visible, as the Laws of any Kingdom or Commonwealth that is or ever was, are Visible. I do not own the Popes Canon Law to have the force of obliging us. For I maintain a great deal of Usurpation in the Power by which it was made; as well as a great deal of abuse, in making the Law given by our Lord of no effect, by the matter of it. But I maintain the Popes Canon Law (and the same is to be said of that Canon Law, whereby the Patriarch of *Constantinople* now governs in the Eastern Church) to be derived from those Rules, whereby the Disciples of our Lord and their Successors governed the Primitive Church in Unity. And this no less evident, than the Christianity of this time is to be derived from the Christianity of that time. For as the present Law of the Church is but the corruption of the Primitive, no more is the present Christianity, (whether of the Reformation, or of the Church of *Rome*) but the corruption of the primitive. For why shall I make nice to say it, pretending all Reformation to be nothing, but the restoring of Primitive Christianity; and, to that end, of such Laws in the Church, as may be the means to restore it?

*The Law which  
endoweth the  
Church with  
consecrated  
goods.*

Among those Laws there is one, which obliging those who have given up themselves to God for Christians, to give up their goods to maintain the Assemblies of the Church, for the Service of God; (wherein the Communion of the Church consisteth) estateth the Power of dispensing the maintenance thereof upon the Rulers of the Church. This provision, how little soever notice many take of it, who pretend to understand the Scriptures; began first in our Lord, and the Disciples that attended upon him continually. For it is evident by the Gospels, that those Disciples which did not attend upon him conti-

continually furnished, by their contributions, a stock whereupon they subsisted. *Judas* you know was trusted with it, and was the first that committed Sacrilege, in robbing the poor of Church goods. For the poor could not have attended upon the Doctrine of our Lord, had they not been provided for, by the richer of his Disciples. And the goods of the Church are still the patrimony of the poor, for the same reason; that being provided for, they may attend upon Gods service. Therefore the reason was the same, when the Christians at *Jerusalem* gave up their lands and their goods, to maintain the Church, in continual attendance upon the Service of God: When the *Corinthians* maintained their Feasts of Love: When the Christians afterwards built those Churches, and laid those lands to them, which *Eusebius* saith, being pulled down and confiscated by *Dioclesian*, were restored by *Constantine*: When Christian Kingdoms and States, by a civil Law, indued the Church with Tithes and Glebes and Mansions. A thing as general as Christianity; no People, no Country being known, where the Church was ever settled, without maintainance estated upon it by the Church it self at the least, if not by the Law of the Country, over and above.

The form of Government, in every Commonwealth, is stated upon a certain powers, wherein Sovereignty consisteth; which Lawyers and Philosophers call sometimes *Jura majestatis*. Here you have, in the Governors of the Church, the power of admitting into and excluding out of the Church: The power of giving Laws to the Church: The power of dispensing the Exchequer which God hath provided for the Church: And in fine the power of propagating these rights to their successors. Whereby it pretendeth not to be a Commonwealth; because Christianity pretendeth to maintain Civil power, and the right of this World, in the same hands and upon the same terms which it findeth. But it appeareth to be a Visible Society founded by God, under the name of the Catholick Church, upon the command of holding communion therewith; to which he obligeth all Christians. And all those Scriptures of the New Testament, that mention any of these rights, signifie no less, when the meaning of them is measured by that Rule, without which there is no means to determine the sense of any Scrip-

*How the Unity of the Church is signified by the Scriptures.*

ture, that is questionable. And the same is signified by those Scriptures, which mention sometimes several Churches, sometimes one Church containing all Christians, and all Churches. For the parts, that is particular Churches, being Visible Bodies, the Whole must needs be understood to be a Visible Church. The practice of all Christians, owning an obligation in point of Right, to maintain the powers, which the Scriptures for the most part only mention as matter of Fact, determines them to signifie more than they express.

*Now in the  
Old Testament.*

As for the Scriptures of the old Testament; the calling of the Gentiles to be one new people of God with the Jews that should believe; it is but foretold in them by Prophecie. And therefore the Visible Unity of the Church, consisting of them, cannot be otherwise declared in them, then by that correspondence, in which the Church answereth the ancient people of God. The Unity thereof was the Unity of a Commonwealth, maintaining it self by force of Arms, in the possession of the Land of promise; in which God had placed them, upon condition to live by his Law. The Unity of the Church, consisting of all Nations, and maintaining all States in their rights of this World, pretendeth not to any power of this World, to maintain it self by. It becometh Visible by the free will of Christians, believing it a piece of their Christianity, to live and die members of one Visible Church. The Unity of the Jews State tending to a temporal end, of enjoying the Land of promise, answereth not the invisible unity of Christian Souls, but the Visible Unity of a Catholick Church; according to that rate, in which the Law answers the Gospel. And so is this point of Christianity no less clearly delivered, by the Old Testament, then other points of the Christian Faith are.

CHAP.

## CHAP. VI.

*How far the Scriptures are clear to be understood, of themselves. Tradition limiteth the sense of the Scripture. Difference between the Tradition of Faith and Ritual Traditions. The difference between Heresie and Schism. The dependence of Churches evidenceth the Unity of the Whole Church. The form of this dependence throughout the Roman Empire. No exception to be made to it, for the Brittiſh Church. Episcopacy, by this form, inviolable in all Opinions; and the Church a standing Synod. The Church Viſible by diſowning Hereticks and Schiſmaticks. The breaches that have come to paſs evidence the ſame.*

**F**Or though all that is neceſſary to be known, for the ſal-  
 vations of all Chriſtians, be not onely ſufficiently, but a-  
 bundantly contained in the Scriptures; yet how clearly there  
 laid down, depends upon the purpoſe, for which God declares  
 that he gave the ſeveral parts of it. It is manifeſt, that God  
 intended to vail the New Teſtament in the Old, and to reveal  
 the Old Teſtament by the New. Therefore Chriſtianity cannot  
 be clearly delivered in the Old Teſtament. Till our Lord was to  
 leave the world, he declared not the condition of Chriſtianity,  
 by which we are ſaved. He declared not that which he de-  
 clared when he was to leave the world; to wit, that it was  
 thenceforth to conſiſt in undertaking to profeſs the Faith of the  
 Holy Trinity, and to live by Chriſts precepts, though ones life

*How far the  
 Scriptures are  
 clear to be un-  
 derſtood, of  
 themſelves.*

Iye upon it. For he declared not the promise of sending the Holy Ghost, till he was ready to leave the World. And therefore the Baptism of Christ, by which Christians do make that profession, which saveth us, was not instituted till his departure. And though our Lord had clearly preached the precepts of Christian life, from the beginning; yet is the Visible estate of his Mystical Body the Church, as well as the invisible estate of particular members, darkly figured and typified, not only by the parables of the Gospel, but, as well by that which befel him, as by that which he did, during the time of his preaching. Therefore neither is Christianity clearly delivered by the Gospels. To them, to whom the Apostles writ their Epistles, the substance of Christianity must needs be known; for they had been made Christians upon the professing of it. But their Epistles, therefore suppose it, and therefore cannot pretend to deliver it. Besides, the greatest part of them is spent in proving that we are saved by Christianity, out of the Old Testament: And therefore, by that correspondence, in which the Law answers the Gospel, the Church, the Synagogue, and the Kingdom of Heaven, the Land of promise. And though our Lord opened his Disciples hearts, thus to understand the Scriptures; yet are not all that shall be saved able to make out this correspondence; the professing and performing of that Christianity, whereby they are saved, not requiring it. Therefore, neither are the Apostles writings clear in things necessary to salvation, but supposing the knowledge of that Christianity, whereby we are saved; nor absolutely clear, but to those that are able to make out that correspondence. Without this limitation, it is not to be granted, that all things necessary to salvation are clear to all that seek salvation, by the Scriptures alone. For what mark is there extant in the Scripture, to distinguish that which is necessary to salvation, from that which is not?

*Tradition limiteth the sense of the Scripture.*

Nor is there any inconvenience in all this, to them that are content to lay prejudice aside, and to see that which they cannot but see. For it will appear by the writings of the Apostles, that they committed the Doctrine of Christianity to them whom they trusted with the founding and governing of the Church; for the instructing of them that were to be baptized, and formed into Churches, whereof the whole Church was to con-

confist. So that as they to whom the Apostles writ; having received their Christianity from those that were so trusted, were to limit the meaping of their writings within that Faith which they had received; so is all interpretation of Scripture still to be confined within that, which the Church from the beginning hath received by their hands. Which is not to make any man Lord of any mans Faith. For this Tradition of the Faith is before the very being of the Church; because whosoever became a Christian, and so a member of the Church; it is supposed that he undertaketh the same. And therefore, being in force before there be any Church, it cannot depend upon any authority to be claimed by the Church. And the evidence for it is the same ground, into which the reason of believing resolveth; the consent of all Christians. Which as it could not have been preserved and obtained, had it not been required to make a man a member of that Church, which by professing it, stood visibly distinct from all that profess it not; So, since as much as is necessary to salvation hath been already declared, by the consent of the Church, to confine all interpretation of Scripture within that which all the Church, every where, at all times hath received, can make no man Lord over the Faith of the Church.

But there is a vast distance between this Tradition of Faith, and other Traditions, which may have proceeded from that authority and trust for founding the Church, which our Lord left with his Apostles, and they with the Church. For that being the condition upon which all Christians are saved, remains alwaies the same, neither to be encreased nor diminished till the Worlds end. But the productions of Ecclesiastical power vested in the Apostles and their successors, can be no more than the limiting of circumstances, according to which the publick service of God is to be performed. And those powers exercised, which God hath granted the Church, for the maintaining of Unity, in serving God according to that Christianity which our Lord teacheth. Christianity is concerned in them but two waies. The first, when they are so far from advancing the service of God, which Christianity requirereth, that it is impaired and destroyed by corruption in them. The second when a part of the Church proceedeth to a change

*Difference between the Tradition of Faith and Ritual Traditions.*



change in them, upon pretense that so it is, though indeed it be otherwise. The first is the plea of the Reformation against the Church of *Rome*; the second, the plea of the Church of *Rome* against them, as to this point of Traditions. And the issue is the same, that is to be tried, between the Church of *England*, and those that stand at this distance from it. For the Unity of the Church being a part of the common Christianity; the breach of it will be chargeable upon that side, which makes such a change, as the rest have not reason to embrace. If the pretense thereof be either not evident, or not sufficient, the fault is in them; if both, in those who refuse to joyn in it. The Rules and Customs and Rites of the Church which are called Traditions, are not commanded because good, but are good because commanded. And therefore, even the Traditions of the Apostles, being of this kind, may cease to oblige by the change that may succeed in the state of the Church, for which they are provided. Instances hereof, recorded in the Scriptures, have been produced.

*The difference  
between Hereticks  
and Schism.*

They therefore that break from the Church, upon any point of the Tradition of Faith; which is before the Church as being requisite to make a man a member of the Church; are properly called Hereticks. For if they only disbelieve in the Heart, they may be counted Hereticks to God; but that is nothing to the Church, of which we now speak. But they that will not stand to the authority of the Church, in matters subject to it, are Schismatics. For those things, to which the authority of the Church extendeth, are the matter of Schism. Not that this difference is always observed. For many times the name of Heresie extendeth to all Sects, which mans choise, not the will of God createth. But because there is that difference visible in the matter of Christianity; which many times appropriateth the common name of Heresie to the most eminent, that separate upon matter of Faith. These things are here premised, to make way for the evidence which I tender, for the Visible Unity of the Church, from the consent of all Christians. He that sticketh at any point of it, may have recourse to the proof which I have made in due place; taking all therefore here for granted.

But

But I will advance another assumption, tending to set the same evidence in better light, by stating the form in which the whole Church, from the Apostles, hath always been grounded, without repeating the proofs whereby it appeareth. A Church then, in the sense of all Christians before the Reformation, is the Body of Christians contained in a City, and the Territory of it. For the Government of such a one, the respective authority of the Apostles, conveyed by the overt act of their Ordination, was visibly vested in a Bishop; in a number of Presbyters, for his advice and assistance; and in Deacons, attending upon them, and upon the executing of their Orders. I say the respective authority of the Apostles; because as less Cities are subject to greater, in Civil Government; so have the Churches of less Cities alwaies depended upon Churches of greater Cities, throughout Christendom. *Rome, Alexandria, Antiochia*, were from the beginning of Christianity, visible heads of these great resorts, in Church Government, which the Council of *Nicaea* made subject to them by Canon Law, for the future. The eminence of other Cities, over their inferiour Churches, appears in the Records of the Church, as soon as there is any mention of them to make it appear. In these Churches, and in the Governours of them, the whole Authority of the Apostles was vested; for they constituted the Church.

*The dependence of Churches evidenceth the unity of the whole Church.*

In process of time the Government of the Roman Empires was moulded anew under *Constantine*, otherwise then it had been by *Augustus*. But this new model was designed by *Adrian*. It made the chief Cities of the chief quarters of the Empire the Residences of the chief Commanders of the Armies, with civil Jurisdictions respective; which civil Jurisdictions *Constantine* left them, when he took from them their commands over the Armies. *Carthage* for *Africk*, *Milain* for *Italy*, (that part which was not under *Rome*) *Triers* for *Gaul*, *Theſſalonica* for *Ilyricum*; *Ephesus* for *Asia*, *Cesarea Cappadocia* for *Pontus*; the pre-eminence of the Churches is as visible over the Churches of their inferiour Cities, in the records of the Church, as the pre-eminence of the Cities in the Records of the Empire. And according to the course of all human affairs, must not this pre-eminence, of necessity, be further limited, enlarged, or abated, in process of time, whether by written Law, or by silent

*The form of this dependence throughout the Roman Empire.*

lent custom. For the effect thereof, I present for your consideration the Canons of the Council of *Sardica*, which I take to be the greatest advantage, that ever lawfully, and by regular means, accrewed to the Church of *Rome*, toward that greatness which since it hath irregularly obtained. For it is visible, that they were the means to extend the superiority thereof over *Illyricum*, which continued, till the Eastern Empire, having the Church of *Rome* in jealousy, laid that whole Jurisdiction under the Church of *Constantinople*. The encrease of which Church, upon the seating of the Empire at that City, (the ground which I alledge for the superiority of all Churches, as it hath been unjustly opposed by the Church of *Rome*, so it is justly owned, by those who protest against the Usurpation of it.

No exception to  
be made to it,  
for the British  
Church.

They that would except *Britain* out of this Rule, upon the act of the Welsh Bishops, refusing *Austine* the Monk for their head; should consider, that St. *Gregory*, setting him over the *Saxon* Church, which he had founded, according to Rule, transgressed the Rule in setting him over the Welsh Church. for the Canon of the Apostles maintains every Nation to be governed by their own Bishop. Which the Welsh had reason then to insist upon, because of the jealousy which appeared from the *Saxons*, of their incroaching upon the Nation, if their Bishop should be owned for the head of the Welsh Church. Setting this case aside, the rest of that little remembrance that remains concerning the British Church, testifies the like respect from it to the Church of *Rome*, as appears from the Churches of *Gaul*, *Spain*, and *Africk*; of which there is no cause to doubt, that they first received their Christianity from the Church of *Rome*. And if so they did, then is there reason to conclude, that they owed it the respect which was due to their Mother Church; But that they either owed it, or shewed it the respect of a Subject to the Sovereign, which now is challenged, none at all. As for *Illyricum*, which shewed the same respect after the Council of *Sardica*; it cannot be thought to have owed it before, because it received not Christianity from *Rome*.

Episcopacy, by  
this form, in-  
vulnerable in all  
opinions; and  
the Church a  
standing Sy-  
nod.

Hereby it may appear, that the Visible Unity of the Church must stand or fall with Episcopacy: And therefore no marvel that it should not be acknowledged, by them who acknowledge

not

not Episcopacy. For the soul of this Unity consisting in the resort of inferiour Churches to superiours, and in the correspondence of parallel Churches; neither can this resort, nor this correspondence ever appear to have been had and exercised, but between Bishops, as heads, in behalf of their Churches. Whether by a treaty of Bishops, personally assembled in Council, or by correspondence between Bishops, by means of their Presbyters, Deacons or Inferiour Clergy, good intelligence were preserved between Churches, towards the maintaining of communion in the whole, it matters not. The Church, in the form which I state, is a standing Synod, able, by consent of the chief Churches, containing the consent of their resorts to conclude the whole. In all the Records of the Church, let them shew me one Presbyter that ever answered for his Church, to the rest of the Church, at least in his own name; (for if in the name of, and by Commission from his Bishop, it is for my turn) and let them take all. And therefore, though Episcopacy must needs be declared for part of Gods Law, by the Scriptures, understood as the consent of the Church directeth; (against which no Scripture can be rightly understood) yet, supposing the Church Visible by Gods Law, I have enough to make them Schismatics that oppose it; though I should make Episcopacy no part of Gods Law, but introduced by consent of the whole Church. For that part which submitteth not to the consent of the Whole, in matters which Gods Law referreth to the Whole, for the preservation of that Unity which it enacteth, are justly to be taken for those that violate the Unity which Gods Law enacteth; especially in a Law of that consequence, as one of those Rights, wherein the chief Power of the Church consisteth. It is strange to see how fondly men argue, That Presbyters have the power of the Keys, which made the Apostles; therefore much more are they equal to Bishops. As if they could not have that Power in private matters, between God and the conscience of particular Christians; reserving the same Power for the Bishops peculiar in things, which, being publick, concern the Body of each Church. For in the cause of *Arius*, this Power was in the Council of *Nicaea*, and in no less. Had *Athanasius* of *Alexandria*, or *Alexander* of *Constantinople* loosed him, whom the Synod had bound; though at

G

the

the instance of *Constantine*; they had been sinners to God and to his Church, in violating the Unity thereof; which he hath made more inviolable then any Temporal endowment of it.

*The Church Visible by disowning Hereticks and Schismatics.*

How far are we now from having evidenced the Visible Unity of Gods Church to be a part of the common Christianity; supposing these things proved, the proofs whereof have now way been infringed? Hereticks are condemned by themselves, saith *Paul*; because they know they forsake that profession, upon which they were baptized Members of the Church. But it is *Titus* that is to refuse them. The Church avoids them because the Bishop finds them incorrigible. If other Bishops, and their Churches, duly informed from *Titus*, do the like, then is the Visible Unity of the Church visible in their proceedings. If they do not the like, then must they break communion with *Titus* and his Church; by a perpetual Rule of the Church, holding all Excommunicate, that shall acknowledge an Excommunicate person to be a Member of the Church. But we read of no breach in the Church, for any of those whom the Church hath declared Hereticks; except what shall by and by be excepted. Thus far all the Church owneth the Visible Unity of the Church. As for Schism, how many occasions of it have been prevented? The difference about keeping *Easter*; the difference about rebaptizing Hereticks: Many other differences have threatned breaches in the Church, which have been prevented, through the conduct of Christian Prelates. Other divisions that have come to pass, have been re-united sometimes, sometimes not. The Communion of the Church of *Sardinia* with the rest of the Western Churches stood interrupted, by the discontents of *Lucifer* Archbishop there; and therefore, I conceive, for his time and no more. The Church of *Antiochia* stood divided within it self, under two Bishops, for a matter of threescore years; till, by the intercession of the West as well as of the East, it was re-united. The East, under *Constantinople*, stood divided from the West under *Rome*, upon the cause of *Acacius*, for some Seventy years; till the Church of *Rome* was satisfied. How long the Schism of *Montanus* lasted, (for at the first it was but a Schism, if we judge by *Tertullian*; who is the best record that remains of it) I say not.

It



It seems to have turned into an Heresie first, and then to nothing, as other Heresies have done. The Schism of the Novatians (for it was no more) seems to have returned to the Church by pieces. And so that of the Meletians. The Donatists seem to have continued, till *Africk* was overrun by the Mahumetans. In all these breaches, what signifies the attribute of one Catholick Church, but a Visible Unity opposite to so many visible Apostasies? *St. Austin* saith, that if a Stranger asked an Heretick or Schismatick the way to the Catholick Church, he durst not shew him the way to his own Church; because the title was not questionable. Not meerly because the Catholick had more belonging to it; (as some would have us judge of Religion by counting Noses) but as *Optatus* saith, *quia rationalis, & ubique diffusa*; because the due reason, why men are Christians, swayd men to stand to the Unity of the Church all over; the undue reason, that moved men to break with it, prevailed but here and there. At all hands, discounting Hereticks and Schismaticks; whom they that follow do seldom approve; so many Christians, so many Witnesses of one Catholick Church; which, by being Catholick, was always, and must needs be Visible. And thus far we have the same evidence for one Visible Church, as for the rest of Christianity.

After the Council of *Ephesus*, the reputation of *Nestorius* held entire in the East, notwithstanding the Decree of the Council. The Records of the Church have preserved us no intelligence, how, or by what means. Those that write of the Wars of the Holy Land afterwards, represent us the Nestorians in the East so numerous, as might well stumble those that pretend to decide the Controversie of Religion by the Poll in our Western parts. But whether the breach stood upon the opinion, or upon the person of *Nestorius*, is more than I am able to decide. For in *Egypt* likewise, after many troubles about the Council of *Chalcedon*, and the condemning of their Bishop *Dioscorus* by it; at length these Churches are counted *Jacobites*, from the name of one *Jacobus Zanzalus*, or little *Jacob* of *Syria*, who is said to have taught them the position of *Emyches*, condemned by that Council. Whether so, or whether a fond zeal for the reputation of *Dioscorus* hath served to divide that people from the Church,

*The breaches  
that have come  
to pass, evidence  
the same.*



upon a meer difference in terms; the breach still continues, and the Abyssines, depending always upon the Church of *Alexandria*, are said to continue in it. Since that, what breach of intercourse and communion hath fallen out between the Greek and Latin Church, or upon what cause, and how far it continues I need not relate. But there can be no question, that it disposed these Western parts to that breach, which the Reformation hath made. Within the Reformation, I need not speak of the Division between the Calvinists on the one side; and the Lutherans in the Empire, the Arminians in the Low Countries, on the other side. I am only this to demand; did ever any of these Parties declare that the Visible Unity, which these breaches interrupt, is not Gods Ordinance? That one of the Parties is not always guilty to God, for the mischief of Schism? That Christian charity is not highly concerned, in violating that Communion which Christianity enacteth? Until the dregs of our times, I do not know that it was ever disputed, that Christians are not bound to be members of one and the same Visible Church. I have already said, that the Reformation was not made by common consent. I must now acknowledge further, that it proceeded not expressly upon Profession of one Visible Church; though neither denying nor questioning the same. No marvel then, if in all things it be not confined to the consequences of it. And therefore, no marvel that dissensions have fallen out in it. No marvel that they, who dare not look so clear a Principle in the face, can wrangle out the salvation of Souls upon petty scruples, which the admitting of it must needs presently disperse.

## C H A P. VII.

*Reformation to be bounded by that wherein the Visible Church agreeth. No change, without regard to the Rules of the Catholick Church. Regular authority in the Church of Rome, the means of Unity; absolute, of Schism. How we are visibly one with the the only Church of GOD, Reforming without the Church of Rome.*

**A**S for the Church of *England*, where Episcopacy stands settled by the Law of the Land, as well as by the Law of God; and the right of goods consecrated to the Service of God, by investing them upon his Church, is maintained by the same; are we not to fear the curse of God, if in all things of Religion we mete not by the same Standard, if we weigh not by the same Weights? Can we pretend to weigh by the same Weights, unless we admit the whole Faith, and all the Laws of the Catholick Church? Unless we confine the Reformation to the restoring of that which hath been, without introducing that which cannot appear to have been? Men see new fancies every day in the Scriptures, which the same man sees not to morrow, another man never sees. The Profession of Faith, the Rules of Government, the Rites of Gods Service are the things, that must make a Church a part or no part of the Whole Church. For if the Church be a Visible Body, it must be visible by the Laws which it useth. And if it be to continue one and the same Body from the first to the second coming of our Lord; the Laws of it will necessarily change, as the Laws of all Bodies do; but the Authority whence they proceed must needs continue the same. If corruption and abuse be.

be to be Reformed, and those in whom the authority visibly resteth, agree not; restoring that which was, you have the Authority of the Apostles and their Successors, for the reviving of their acts; introducing that which was not, you go by the Spirit of the Fanaticks, the dictate whereof appears not in the Scriptures, by the consent of the Church. In fine, matter of Faith is, to the worlds end, the same that the whole Church hath always from the beginning professed. If you impose more, the Church of *Rome* will have a better pretence than you can have; namely, a better claim to the authority of the Church. For it is an imposture to induce any man to think, that, professing Christianity, they can renounce the Scriptures. The issue is, and will be, whether you or the Church shall be Judge; until you distinguish between the present Church and the Whole Church; not contesting the Faith of the present Church, so far as it holds with the Whole. But in matter of Church-Law, which, for the reason that hath been said, is necessarily changeable; though the difference of times, and the estate of things, will not endure the restoring of Primitive Discipline; yet shall it be easie thereby to discern, what is abated for Unities sake, what is rejected, because the Catholick Church and the Laws of it are not owned.

*No change,  
without regard  
to the Rules of  
the Catholick  
Church.*

And upon these terms it will be easie to answer all demands, not only here, but at the great day of Judgment; at which, otherwise, the account cannot be clear. They that would have it thought, that the mischiefs which we have seen have not been acted for nothing, would have the Law of the Kingdom, in matter of Religion, changed to give them content; without considering what cause we give the Church of *Rome* to take us for Schismatics, balking the Whole Church, that we may be reconciled to those that have broken from us. For supposing for the present, though not granting, that all Papists are Idolaters, and the Pope Antichrist; the Unity of the Church is nevertheless, as it hath been proved, a part of Christian truth. Nor can Papists be Idolaters, or the Pope Antichrist, for believing any thing which the Whole Church believeth; for commanding, or for practicing that, which the whole Church hath commanded or practiced. Nay, not for that which the Whole Church of any age hath allowed part of the Church to practice.

For

For God forbid it should be said, (which it were senseless to imagine) that part of the Christian World should own part of it for Christians, being indeed Idolaters, and Partizans of Antichrist. The Church must have been utterly lost in that case; and the Reforming of it must not be the mending of the old Church, but the making of a new Church. Yet is it not enough for these men to alledge the Ancient Church in any particular. They must weigh by their own Weights, and mete by their own Standard, if they will not fall under Gods curse. They that stand not to the consent of the Church in all things, answer themselves when they alledge it. Nay, they may invite us to be Schismatics for their sakes, in that, for which they truly alledge the Ancient Church. A justifiable, nay a commendable custom of the Ancient Church may come out of use, without any violence, any fraud, any purpose to defeat that pious intent, to which such a custom was instrumental. They who had rather break with the Church of Rome, than comply with a change, which the change of time, and the state of things by time, hath brought to pass, should be, in my opinion, Schismatics. But what if our Fanatics should be content silently to return into the communion of this Church, as Presbyterians? What if it appear, that they are Bullion Hereticks, for the positions they profess; though not stamped by conviction, and contumacy succeeding, and the Declaration of the Church upon that? It will not then be clear how we shall wipe off that imputation, to which we shall be liable by the perpetual Rule of Gods Church; for receiving and communicating with those that have stamped themselves Schismatics as Schismatics, those that have declared themselves Bullion Hereticks, as Bullion Hereticks; without any ground to presume that they are changed. Certainly we cannot alledge the Catholick Church for our selves, but it will rise in judgment against us, when we stick not to it.

What condition we fall into, if we submit to the Church of Rome, upon terms of conquest, it is manifest enough. For wherein the Pope hath not limited his own authority, by the Council of Trent, we render our selves to the mercy of it. The Missionaries shall have done a great effect, if they perswade us that we are Schismatics, unless we return to those abuses, which we see with our eyes, which we handle with our hands, they are

*Regular authority in the Church of Rome: the means of unity, absolute, of Schism.*

are so evident and so gross. Well may they perswade simple Christians, that they must first resolve which is the true Church, and then, what is true and what is false in Religion, by that which the Church, so resolved, teaches. This is a great deal the shorter way, than to justify the particulars, which by this means they impose upon them. And if we render our selves upon these terms, what remains, but that we admit whatsoever the Pope shall impose for the future; though we know, that the Power of the Whole Church extends not to it? Which, how shall we answer at the Day of Judgment, either for our selves, or those that depend upon us? And yet I have shewed, that the Church of *Rome* hath, and ought to have, when it shall please to hear reason, a regular preheminance over the rest of Christendom, in these Western parts. And he that is able to judge, and willing to consider, shall find that preheminance the only reasonable means to preserve so great a Body in Unity. And therefore, I count not my self tied to justify *Henry* the VIII. in disclaiming all such preheminance; when it was enough for his purpose to disown it, as not extending to his case. For by the regular constitution of the Church, which I have described, if the Pope excommunicate any man unjustly, he does it in his own wrong; he excommunicates himself thereby, from all that shall adhere to him whom he excommunicates. His advantage is only this; if more adhere to the chief Church than to the less. For which, though there be regularly a presumption; yet, if Usurpation appear, either in sentencing, or in the matter, or in the effect of the sentence, he that exceeds his authority breaks it upon him that exceeds not, like the waves of the Sea against a Rock.

*How we are  
visibly one with  
the only Church  
of God, Reform-  
ing without the  
Church of  
Rome.*

But of the Usurpations of that Church, wherein they consist, and by what means effected, in due place; that the difference may be visible, between the infinite and the regular Power of the Pope. In the mean time, what I have said of this Point, I must say of all matters in difference; That as the Church of *Rome* cannot hinder us of restoring our selves to the Primitive Right of the Church, by which a Christian Kingdom duly may maintain the Service of God; (neither consenting to the abuses which other Churches maintain, nor breaking with them in other matters) so are we to go no further, then

then the consent of the Church will bear us out. For if we make new and private conceits of the Scripture, and the sense of it, Law to the Church which we Reform, we found a new Church upon that Christianity which the only Church of God never owned. But if we only restore that, which by abuse of time may appear to have come to decay; we impe and ingraff the Church which we Reform, into that only Church, which they that Reformed not succeed. For how should we depart from Unity with that Church, the authority whereof we follow in the change which we make? If therefore we are to be without offence to Jews and Gentiles, and to the Churches of God, as St. Paul commands; then are we to be without offence also to the Church of Rome. Now it is no offence to the Church of Rome, that we build Unity among our selves upon an opposition to the abuses of it. But if upon an opposition to that which it holdeth from the whole Church; we give them cause to take us for Schismatics, as not reverencing in her, the Whole Church, which we are bound to hold with.

## CHAP. VIII.

*What Means God hath provided private Christians to discern the true Church. The duty of all Estates, for the Re-uniting of Schism. The ground and extent of Secular Power in Church Matters. How the Conscience of Sovereign Power is discharged, maintaining the Church.*

UPON these terms the choice of Religion would become more clear ( which otherwise must become far more doubtful ) by the settling of our present differences. For I grant it a thing too difficult for every Christian, that is concerned

*what means  
God hath provided  
private  
Christians to  
discern the true  
Church.*

H



cerned to chuse his Communion, to try the particulars in controversy by the consent of the Church. But I maintain the same difficulty in trying which Church it is, that *preacheth the true Word of God, and rightly and duly administred the Sacraments*; which others would have the marks of the true Church. For without trying the particulars in Controversie, how shall it appear where the Word is preached, where the Sacraments are ministred as they should be? And how shall they be tryed, but by the Scriptures, expounded according to the consent of the Church? As for them that would have us take the decree of the present Church to be Infallible; they are first to tell us, upon whose credit we take that Infallibility. For you see, we believe not the present Church that it is the Church; to wit, founded by God. We accept it upon the consent of the whole Church. Neither is any thing Infallible in Christianity, but upon the same ground. It is not the decree of the present Church, but the witness and agreement of the Whole Church, that renders any thing Infallible. Now it is true, every Christian hath the Judgment of discretion, in the choice of Religion, *in point of Fact*; That is to say; supposing the division, or rather the divisions that are on foot in the Church. But *in point of Right*, it ought to be otherwise, God having provided the Unity of the Church, on purpose, that simple Christians might not be put to so hard a choice. For when the Catholick Church was so Visibly distinct from all Sects, that a Sectary would have been laughed at, had he called his own Church the Catholick Church of that City; wilfully must he perish, that should forsake that Church, which he could not mistake. But in our case, what avails it to alledge the Title of Catholick, while the ground of the Title remains disputable? Especially, the division between the Greek and Latin Church having rendred it almost insignificant afore: And the number of Protestants, as I said of *Nestorians*, rendring it questionable, where the signification will light.

The duty of all  
states, for the  
re-uniting of  
Schism.

Seeing therefore, that the malice of man, by dividing the Church, rendreth it *Invisible*, as hard to be seen; though not *Invisible*, as not possible to be seen; What remaineth, but that all publick persons, and whosoever is interessed in the divisions of the Church, understand and consider what account they owe,  
for

for the Souls than must needs miscarry, by the divisions, which they maintain when they need not? For how shall he be clear that professes not a desire of condescending to all that which truth will allow, on either side, for the advantage of peace on both sides? And seeing neither side can make peace without the consent of both, but either may have truth alone; What remaineth, but that all Reformation be confined within those bounds, which the Faith and the Law of the Catholick Church fixeth? For though they that profess and intend to Reforme by that Rule may fail, in applying their Rule to some matters; though seeing what the Rule requires, they may be fain to abate of it, because the Body which they intend to regulate is not capable of the strict Rule; Yet it is a reasonable ground of confidence for a single heart, that the Right Rule is expressly professed to be intended. For though in all divisions, the parties acknowledging One Visible Church, must needs hold the one the other Schismatics, unless they will bear the blame of the division themselves: Yet is there no appearance in reason, that God will take them for Schismatics, that follow so fair a profession in general, though it may not come to effect in some particular.

And this is the only way to provide a clear discharge for the Secular power, that is Sovereign; in establishing such a Reformation by Law to the people of it, and enacting the same with such priviledges and penalties, as Christianity either alloweth or requireth. For it is manifest from the premises, that the Church, by Gods Law, is Judge in the matter of all Laws, according to which, Religion is to be enacted by any Sovereign. Yet is the Sovereign Power Judge also of their Judgment, as not only it self, a Member of the Whole Church, and Heir to all right, which the Unity thereof intitleth any Christian to; but as Protector of the Church, and of the Faith, and Laws of it: That is, as Protector of all Subjects within the Church of the respective Dominions, in all right, which the Law of the Church in the Dominion thereof setteth. And therefore bound to judge, whether that which the Church, either of the respective Dominion, or united with the same, shall determine, be such, as the Unity of the Whole Church either alloweth, or requireth; or not. For it is only the Sovereign

*The ground and extent of Secular power in Church matters.*

Power, that can enact it for a Law upon all the Subjects thereof, to the effect of Secular priviledges or penalties. And seeing the Faith and communion of the Church is the inheritance of of the Secular Power, that is Christian; It is manifest that he is trusted for his Subjects, in matter of Religion, to no purpose, if he be to trust the Church at large, in the matter of his Office. And yet Gods Law having provided the Church to limit all matters questionable upon the constitution of the Church; It is also manifest, that all Secular power is to suppose the Faith of the Church, as always the same from the beginning: And the Laws in being, as acts of the same authority which was founded by God in the Whole Church from the beginning, before any Secular Power was Christian; which if it protect not, why is it Christian? I say it is bound to accept them for such, in case it appear not, by the Faith and the Laws of the Whole Church, that they are otherwise. And in that case, though the Secular Power be Judge for it self; yet the Church, and the Law of the Church, is the Rule by which it is to judge. As for that which present necessity requireth to be restored, or settled anew for the Church respective to every Sovereignty: It is also manifest, that the Secular power both may, and ought to see the Church under it to do their Office; knowing that it is their Office, as to preserve the Faith, which is always the same; so to maintain Unity by suting the Laws which are to be with those which have been from the beginning; whereof common reason, in all publick Powers, is a competent Judge. I need say nothing, that Secular Powers may, and are to see, that under pretence of Ecclesiastical Power, or Jurisdiction, their own rights be not invaded, having said, that the power of the Church produceth no Secular effect. But as the enacting of the Church Laws, with Secular Priviledges and Penalties, is onely the effect of Secular Power; so it is accountable to God alone for the use of it.

*How the Conscience of Sovereign Power is discharged, maintaining the Church.*

And as the Unity of the whole Church must needs be concerned in the Laws of the Church, respective to this or that Sovereignty; So is it not possible, that any Sovereign should be Judge, in the concernments of those that are not his Subjects. The divisions of Christendom, which I alledged afore, make full evidence for this. For what need further dispute about

about Religion, were Subjects, as Subjects, by Gods Law bound to stand to the will of their Sovereign, in that which concerns them as Christians? This shews how much Sovereigns are concerned, for their discharge to God, to seek the peace of Christendom. For if as at present, it cannot be had upon just terms, it is not the opinion of this or that Divine, it is not the opinion of any person whatsoever, not acting in a quality capable, by the constitution of the Church, to oblige the Church respective to the Sovereign; Much less is it his personal skill in matters of Religion, (though as great as any mans) that can serve for his discharge to God. He is answerable to God, notwithstanding any such advise, for any wrong, that the priviledges and penalties otherwise enacted may do. But maintaining, first the expresse profession of the Rule hitherto established; bounding all Reformation of the present Church by that which the consent of the whole Church either alloweth or requireth, then maintaining them in their Office, whose Office it is, to form that which his act must make Law to his Subjects; there will need no more for his discharge to God, then the use of that Judgment which God hath endowed him with, to discern, whether the Rule which he protecteth be duly applied to that which he enacteth, or not. For as no reason can be excused to God, transgressing that which it seeth: So in things doubtful, to prefer any reason before that which God trusteth in the matter of such trust, is to render a mans self accountable to God for that wrong which may be done, for which otherwise those that are trusted by God should be accountable.

CHAP.

## CHAP. IX.

*Difficulty in receiving the Fanaticks into this Church. How their Positions destroy the Faith. Absolute Predestination to Glory destructive to Christianity. Justifying Faith includeth the profession of Christianity. The Nature of Faith, according to the Scriptures, sheweth the same. So doth the state of that Question which St. Paul disputeth. The consent of the Church herein; with the ground of it. The sence of this Church.*

*Difficulty  
in receiving  
the Fanaticks  
into this  
Church.*

**B**UT I must now profess, that the weightiest point, in re-uniting the breaches of Religion in this Church, is the Conditions, upon which the Fanaticks may be, either reconciled to it, or shut out of it; whether with free exercise of their several Sects, or under certain penalties, as Recusants. I see that they are not afraid to pretend a further liberty, of Publick Preachers, even since the Laws of this Land were in force. For I find that such of them, as are not Ministers of Congregations do notwithstanding stile themselves *Publick Preachers*. Which is nothing else, then to pretend that authority from the Secular power, which they had by the late Usurpation; to seduce as many of his Majesties Subjects as they can to their Conventicles. But that I will say nothing of, because I make certain account, that whensoever we come to any settlement in Religion, they will find that their pretense to be vain. That which I insist upon is that which I conceive I have proved; that the positions which they notoriously challenge are down-right Heresie; wanting only conviction to produce, either conversion or contumacy: and the declaration of the Church upon the same

same. For it is notorious, that they challenge the present endowment of Gods Spirit, and the certainty of Salvation for the future, upon no further consideration, then of their persons; as not depending upon the Christianity which they either profess or perform. So far they are from acknowledging, that it dependeth upon their being Members of Gods Church, by living according to that Christianity which it professeth. For because they think themselves Members of Christ, before they be Members of Gods Church, therefore they think themselves enabled by God, to divide the Church *in infinitum*: And that the Conventicles of their Congregations are Churches to the same effect, with those which were founded by the Apostles, though they profess not the Faith, though they renounce the Unity of one Visible Church. Therefore they openly allow those who maintain, that *God can see no sin in his Elect*: That *their sins are pardoned from everlasting*, before they be done; that God shall not judge by our works, but by his own decrees; That there are inspirations of the Holy Ghost without the Word, though not against it; for dear Members of Christ and the cream of Christians. And hence comes the everlasting divisions which they maintain. For to renounce those bounds, which the Faith of the Church, and the Unity thereof fixeth, is enough to commend them to all parties that do so, for the Godly. In fine, the whole fry of this error resolves it self in two Positions: That God predestineth to Salvation, meerly in consideration of mens persons, and not of any Christianity, which they should be found to have professed and performed: And that the knowledge of this Predestination, revealed by the Word, and sealed by the Spirit, immediately not supposing the Christianity which they profess and perform, is that Faith which only justifieth.

I cannot say that the Presbyterians do expressly profess these Positions. For they have an express Confession of their Faith, which expresseth them not. But seeing them, in all occasions of publick confusion, render themselves considerable by these Fanaticks, as being of one and the same party; I must take it for granted, that they think their profession reconcileable with these positions. Especially knowing how many particular Divines, and Preachers of that party, have maintained the same:

Namely,

*How their Positions destroy the Faith.*



Namely, all that maintain justifying Faith, and the Knowledge and Assurance of a mans Salvation, without and before Repentance. I do not then say, that the belief of absolute Predestination is Heresie in the sight of God. Because it may be held with other positions, which are an antidote to the venom of it, as being really contradictory to it; which contradiction, did those that hold it perceive, they could not hold it. For this contradiction suffers not the consequence of Heresie to take effect. But both positions together I have maintained to be down-right Heresie. Neither have I been shewed, or of my self discovered any reason sufficient to think otherwise. And therefore I must continue to *weigh by my own Weights*, and to *mete by my own Measures*.

*Absolute Predestination to Glory destroys all to Christianity.*

For that the ground and substance of Christianity is utterly inconsistent with the Decree which they imagine, is manifest if any thing can be manifest in Christianity. Because if there were any such Decree, then could not men be judged at the last day, as judged they shall be, by their works. There is no Decree of God that shall not be executed. If God Decree from everlasting, to give glory and torment for everlasting, without considerations of mens works; then must he without such consideration, give it in time. For otherwise, he should not execute that which he decrees. And indeed, such a Decree can no way be undefeasible, as all Gods Decrees must be, unless God determine and move every man to every thing that he doth, every moment of his life, upon the account whereof he shall be saved or damned; And that before his own will determine or move it self. But if God should so determine and move mans will, then would the tender of the Gospel be a meer abuse, and a mockery; inviting mankind to Salvation upon a Condition, which unless God determine and move him to perform, he cannot; if he do, he cannot but perform. The justice of Gods proceedings at the last day stands upon this, That a man might have transgressed that, for which he is rewarded or punished: And the obligation of Christianity in this, that by the help which it tendreth, a man is able to do that which it requireth. Again, if we may be assured of the effect of our Christianity, (the endowment of Gods Spirit here, and everlasting salvation in the world to come) before we be assured

assured that we have performed it; how can we be obliged, either to profess or to perform that, which it is to no effect either to profess or to perform, if the effect be had without either professing or performing it? For I challenge the common reason of men to question this, That no effect can depend upon any condition, which a man can be sure of, before he be sure, whether he have the condition or not. So that he that is sure of his Salvation, before he be sure whether he be a good Christian or not, cannot think it a condition necessary to Salvation, that he be a good Christian. And therefore must needs think that he may be saved, without being a good Christian. Nor will it serve the turn to say, that he is not therefore saved without being a good Christian; because, if he be so assured, he is also assured that God will make him a good Christian. For in that case Christianity would not be the condition upon which Salvation, and therefore the assurance of Salvation, should depend; but a mean by which God would save him, whom he should decree to save, upon no condition of being a Christian. Whereas if Christianity be true, and if God shall judge us by our Works, we must be saved by performing that Christianity which we are to profess, and not otherwise.

For I must here begin, where I left afore; when I said, that they who define Justifying Faith, without including the profession of Christianity in it, do mistake the very ground of the Christian Faith. No man can be a Disciple of Christ, (that is, a Christian; for they who were called Disciples of Christ afore, were called Christians at *Antiochia*) without taking up Christs Cross; that is, professing to die for Christianity, if it be requisite: if not, to forgo any advantage of this World, which a man cannot hold, doing the duty of a good Christian. It is manifest, that it is not the inward belief of the heart, but the outward profession of the mouth, that rendreth a Christian liable to Christs Cross. For could a man be saved denying Christ, there were no cause why he should suffer for Christ. Seeing therefore that Christ manifestly requires a Christian to take up his Cross; it is manifest, that Justification, which Christianity promisseth, is not to be had without professing Christianity. Who ever believed it, but the Disciples of *Simon Ma-*

*Justifying  
Faith includeth  
the Profession of  
Christianity.*

gus, the Gnosticks, that would needs go for Christians with Christians, but do as Jews or Gentiles did, to avoid persecution from Jews or Gentiles? *With the heart a man believeth to righteousness*, saith St. Paul. Good reason. For he that believeth that God sent our Lord to preach that righteousness which Christianity professeth, must be a strange creature, if he find not himself obliged to the righteousness which God sent him to preach. But it is inherent righteousness, to which the belief of Christs message and commission induceth. That righteousness to which salvation belongeth, by that positive will of God which his Gospel declareth, is an attribute which the said gracious will of God alloweth, when the worth of inherent righteousness cannot challenge it. Therefore *with the mouth a man professeth to salvation*, saith St. Paul. The positive Will of God hath tied the promise of salvation for the future, and Justification, (the title to salvation) for the present, to the positive act of professing Christianity; not to the perpetual obligation of all righteousness. And therefore this profession was not necessary, till our Saviour commanded to baptize in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, at his going out of the world. Not that before that time, the Disciples of Christ could be saved, denying Jesus to be the Christ. But because the profession of Christianity was not properly the condition of salvation, till the Baptism of Christ was instituted; till the Apostles were commanded to make men Christians, (*teaching them to observe all that Christ had given them in charge;*) by baptizing them in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. So that by this precept, wherein the sum and substance of Christianity consisteth, the profession of Christianity, which our Lord had required, for the condition of his Gospel before, was limited to the Faith of the Holy Trinity, for matter of belief; though extending to all that our Lord had taught afore, concerning the life of a Christian. And herewith agreeth the doctrine of St. Peter, 1 Pet. III. 20. ascribing salvation to Baptism, not in regard of cleansing the flesh, which is the outward ceremony, but of the profession of Christianity, when it is made with a good conscience; whereby a man solemnly undertakes that righteousness which Christianity requires. And hereupon the belief of *one Catholick Church* becomes a part of the common Christi-

Christianity: as the founding of it becomes a necessary consequence of making salvation to consist in professing Christianity. For as it were ridiculous to think, that any man can attain salvation by making that profession, which, out of a good conscience, he intendeth not to perform: so were it ridiculous to think, that a man should attain the state of salvation, by professing that for Christianity, which the profession of *one Catholick Church* of God doth not allow.

Add hereunto the consideration of the name and nature of Faith, and the attributes and effects that are ascribed unto it in holy Scripture. It is certain that Faith signifieth, commonly, the belief of Christs Gospel. It signifies also, oft enough, trust and confidence in God; and that through our Lord Christ, when the Faith of Christians is meant. But the one of these goes before Justification, the other comes after and presupposes it. For who will undertake that all those who believe that Christs Gospel is true, are justified, though they live not as it requireth? And yet it is plain, that no man is justified but he that so believeth. Now trust in God is either confidence that God will be, or that he is reconciled. The Gospel is sufficient ground of assurance, that God will be reconciled with whosoever will undertake the condition which it requireth. But he that hath this confidence is not justified by it, but by undertaking the condition which it requireth. Therefore he hath this confidence before he be justified. For being once justified, he hath ground to trust in God as reconciled. But he must be justified before this confidence can be well grounded. For otherwise it will be so far from justifying, that he will be condemned for it. There is therefore a third signification of *Faith* in holy Scripture, comprising the outward act of professing, as well as the inward act of believing: And supposing this outward act of profession limited, by the positive Law of the Gospel, to the Sacrament of Baptism. According to which signification the Ancient Church counted not Christians *Fideles*, *faithful* or *believers*, till they were baptized. This is in the middle between the other two. For as Belief goes before it, so it is the ground of the trust and confidence of a Christian. And this therefore is that, which all those Scriptures that ascribe the Promises of the Gospel to Faith, make properly justifying Faith. For according

*The Nature of Faith, according to the Scriptures, sheweth the same.*

ing to the use and custom of all Languages, they are ascribed to Belief by a Metonymy of the cause going before; to trust and confidence by a Metonymy of the effect following upon it. But this will not hold, till we pitch upon that which comes between both, as that which qualifyeth a Christian for those promises. When therefore the belief of Christs Gospel causes a man to take up Christs Cross in Baptism, then hath he that Faith which justifyeth; though that which prepares to it, and that which insues upon it, are honoured with the same attribute, for being so neer of kindred to it.

So doth the  
state of that  
Question, which  
St. Paul disputa-  
th.

But the consideration of the Question which St. *Paul* disputeth, visible in the Writings of the Apostles, suffereth no doubt of his meaning when he argueth, that *Faith alone* justifyeth. It is as clear as the Sun at noon, that all his Dispute is with those Christians, who, having submitted to the Gospel, could not conceive that the Law had no hand in justifying them, whom they saw live according to the Law: And that, by the direction of the Apostles themselves, for the gaining of the Jews. A thing which they dispensed with for a long time, till St. *Paul* was constrained to declare against it, as rooting up the necessity of Christianity, and salvation by it alone. That this is the state of the Question, all the New Testament, after the Gospels, is witness. And therefore to be justified by *Faith alone*, is with St. *Paul* to be justified by *Christianity alone*. And whereas they were all assured, that salvation was to be had under the Law; he shews every where, that the Fathers, who were justified before, or under the Law, were not justified by the Law, but by the Gospel, that was veiled under it; not as Jews but as Christians. And therefore, that the Gentiles which turned Christians were saved by the same Grace, as believing Jews. For as no works, which they were able to do by the light and strength of Nature, were able to bring those that were without the Law to the state of Gods Grace, no more could the outward observation of *Moses* Law, by those works which meer nature was able to produce, (as tending no further than the temporal reward of the Land of *Canaan*, expressly promised by *Moses* Law) render men acceptable to God, for the reward which Christians expect in the world to come. But by *Hegesippus* in *Eusebius* we understand, That the Gnosticks, teaching that



that the bare profession of Christianity, without bearing the Cross for the performing of it, was enough to save those that should attain to the secrets which they taught; debauched and deflowred the Church of *Jerusalem*, as soon as *St. James* was dead. And therefore seeing that could not be done in a moment, we have cause to think that they went to work in his life time. The consideration whereof shews, that *St. James*, in arguing that a Christian is justified by Works, and not by Faith alone; intended to teach, that the Profession of Christianity justifieth not when it is not performed. And therefore *St. Paul* intended the same, in arguing, that a Christian is justified by Faith alone, without the works of the Law. To wit, that he is justified by professing Christianity so cordially, and with so good a conscience, as to perform it.

And for this sense of the Scriptures, there is as current and as general a consent of all the whole Church, as for Christianity it self; the life and soul whereof standeth in it. Shew me any Author approved in the Church, that ever allowed salvation without Baptism, when it could be had; (when it could not, the profession of him that desireth it is as clear as if his flesh were cleansed) that compriseth not the taking up of Christ's Cross, by professing Christianity in the nature and virtue of Justifying Faith; that opposeth that Faith which alone justifieth to any other works, than those of *Moses* Law. But there is no such thing to be shewed. This is every where to be shewed, in all Writings any way allowed by the Church; that the Justification of a Christian dependeth upon the performance of that which he professeth: And the Promises of the Gospel, which which he attaineth by undertaking to live as a Christian, upon the good works whereby he performeth the same. And the honour of Christianity cannot stand otherwise. There is no sin which it cleanseth not. The reason is, because there is no righteousness to which it obligeth not. He who believeth, that our Lord Christ tendereth salvation, upon condition of believing and living as a Christian, cannot expect that which he tendereth, without returning that which he requireth. But he that is overtaken in sin, by this Faith, can do no more for the present, than undertake so to believe, and so to live for the future. Thereby he undertakes all righteousness for the future. And by undertaking it,

*The consent of  
the Church  
herein, with the  
ground of it.*

is.



is translated from the state of damnation for sin, to the state of salvation by grace. Which if he attain without undertaking, if he retain without performing, then doth not Gods glory appear by his Gospel. But there is nothing so particular to this purpose as those sayings, whereby the Fathers declare, that a Christian is justified by Faith alone, in case he die upon his Baptism; if he survive then, that he is justified by the works, whereby his profession is performed. Of which sayings, having produced a considerable number, I am by them to measure the meaning of all the rest of their Writings.

*The sense of  
this Church.*

The Articles of this Church, setting forth Justification by Faith alone for a most wholsom Doctrine, and full of comfort; for the sense of it refer us to the Homily upon that subject. I will not say that my Position is laid down in that Homily. For there are many passages of it, which shew them that penned it no way clear in that point. Yet there are divers sentences of the Fathers alledged in it, which cannot be understood to other purpose; and other passages well agreeing with it. But in the Church Catechism, and in the Office of Baptism, it is so clearly laid down, as will serve for ever to silence any other sense. And though that which the Clergy subscribeth be, as it ought to be, a wholsom Doctrine; to wit, if soundly understood; yet that by which Christian people are saved, ought to be that, which the Offices of the Church, and the instruction which it proposeth, contain.

C H A P.

## C H A P. X.

*Why Justifying Faith is not trust in God through Christ. Of Justification according to the Council of Trent. Of Justification according to Socinus. Wherein his Heresie consisteth. How the misunderstanding of Satisfaction and Imputation occasioned it. Upon what grounds he is to be refuted. The helps of Grace granted in consideration of Christs Obedience. And therefore they infer Original Sin by the Fall of Adam. Wherein the Covenant of Grace consisteth. That the state of Grace is forfeited by hainous Sin. The danger of the contrary Position according to the ground of it.*

NOW I confesse there is another opinion of Justifying Faith, <sup>why justifying</sup> in which I find nothing of any consequence that is destructive to Christianity; namely, <sup>Faith is not</sup> that which placeth Justifying Faith in trust and confidence of Gods mercy through Christ. <sup>trust in God</sup> For this opinion necessarily suppoeth Repentance to go before Justifying Faith. And Repentance, understanding it to be the Repentance of one that turns from all Sin to all Righteousness; such as is the Repentance of him that first turneth Christian; signifies as much as the undertaking of Christianity. Only it signifies this resolution *in the way* not *in the end*, not made but in making, *in fieri* not *in facto esse*. But understanding the Repentance of a Christian, turning from some particular sin to God, according to the obligation of his Christianity; his being justified of that sin,

sin, or from that sin, will of necessity require and presuppose his Repentance for that sin. Notwithstanding, because this opinion expresseth only the inward act of Faith to be the condition that qualifyeth a Christian for the promises of the Gospel; though it doth not exclude the profession of the outward man; I have laid it aside, not only as not true, for the reasons that I have given already, but as not sufficiently expressing the condition of the Covenant of Grace. For it is therefore, the means to continue those everlasting Disputes about Justification by Faith alone, which the very mention of the outward act of Profession, limited, for the manner of it, to the *Sacrament of Baptism*, utterly extinguisheth.

Of Justification  
according to the  
Council of  
Trent.

As for the Decree of the Council of *Trent*, seeming to confine the justification of a Christian to the infusion of habitual righteousness into that soul, which being truly contrite for the sense of sin, and the offence of God by it, resolves, for the love of God above all, to live as a Christian for the future, professing so much by being baptized; it is liable to a twofold challenge. First, for excluding the positive act of Gods Law, which the Gospel enacteth, by accepting the righteousness of a Christian, as a condition sufficiently qualifying for the Promises of the Gospel by Gods original Justice. Secondly, for excluding the imputation of Christs obedience from the consideration, in which a Christian is justified and saved, and in a word, intitled to the Promises of the Gospel. A thing which that Council need not have done. For it is manifest, that *Pighius*, *Gropper*, Cardinal *Comarino*, *Cassander*, and many others, the best studied in *Luthers* controversies of all that communion, had owned and embraced it for the Doctrine of *St. Bernard*, and divers other highly approved Authors. Besides that, including the Sacrament of Baptism; that is, the outward act of professing Christianity; in the condition upon which a Christian is justified, it is not possible to exclude, either the act of Gods positive will, to which the Gospel engageth him, or the consideration of Christs obedience, from the same. And including the consideration of them, the justification of a Christian will of necessity consist in the gracious account of God, accepting of him that is chargeable with sin, for righteous; though it presupposes in him that habitual Righteousness, whereby he resolves

solves to live and die a good Christian. And therefore they also, not excluding expressly that which they do not expressly include, the worse Divines they would be, as to this opinion, the better Christians they are; that is, the less they depart from the right Rule of Faith.

And indeed the Heresie of *Socinus*, which hath appeared since that Council, gives cause to believe, that the imputation of Christs Righteousness to the justifying of a Christian (which the Reformation, for good reasons, insisted upon) was not distinctly understood between the parties, as it ought to have been. He maketh the belief of Christianity to be that Faith which alone justifieth, in this regard; because he that believes it to be true, must needs find himself obliged, for his salvation, to live and die a good Christian. Which had been a very good reason, why justification should not be ascribed to Faith alone. For if a man be saved by living and dying a good Christian indeed, not by finding himself obliged so to do; then is he justified by undertaking to profess Christianity, and not by believing it; though by believing it, he is obliged so to do. But as for the profession of Christianity; I do not marvel that he who intended to bring in a new Christianity should make no reckoning of it, in the condition upon which a Christian is saved. For it is the Christianity of the Catholick Church, which he that will be saved must profess, if he mean to be saved by professing true Christianity. And therefore, the profession of *one Catholick Church* is a part of it. And therefore he hath found the true consequence of his own position; when he makes no more of Baptism than of an indifferent ceremony, which the Church may use or not, at pleasure. For how should any man make any more of Baptism, that allows salvation before it; and therefore without it? Otherwise *Socinus* is free enough, in ascribing the effect of justifying, not to the worth of that Faith which believeth, or of that Christianity, to which it resolveth; But the meer Grace of God, of his own free goodness, sending by Christ salvation to mankind overtaken in sin, upon the condition of their Christianity for the future.

The venom of this Heresie lies in excluding the consideration of the obedience and sufferings of Christ, either from the  
 K reason,

*Of justification  
according to  
Socinus.*

*wherein his  
Heresie consist-  
eth.*

reason, for which God grants the Grace that makes men good Christians, or for which he rewards their Christianity with the life of the World to come. The Decree of the Council of *Trent* fully acknowledge the consideration of Christs merits, in the helps of grace, without which we are not good Christians. But in as much as it maketh Christians righteous before God by their habitual righteousness; insomuch, and so far, must it needs exclude the consideration thereof, from the condition qualifying for everlasting life. That is, as they expressly include it not, so they may be said to exclude it. Though on the other side, as they expressly exclude it not, so they may be said to include it. But *Socinus* hath plainly taken up divers Articles of the Heresie of *Pelagius*; affirming that *Adam* must have dyed, though he had not sinned: and that Christ came not to cure any sin, that by his fall is become Original to his Posterity, or to procure any Grace, which Original sin rendreth necessary to make us good Christians; but only to assure the World, by his Doctrine, and by his example, that God will make good his Message, if we fail not on our side. And having thus excluded the consideration of his merit, either in declaring the Gospel, or in performing it; what necessity remained, why he should be God? This is the Pedigree of this Heresie, complicated of the Heresie of *Pelagius* and *Paulus Samosatenus*; as this latter, of the Heresies of *Ebion* and *Artemas*, and of *Sabellius*. For as *Liberatus*, Arch-deacon of *Carthage*, hath well observed, in his abridgment of the Troubles of *Nestorius* and *Euryches*; *Samosatenus*, denying the God-head of Christ, with *Ebion* and *Artemas*, as concerning the Holy Ghost, must of necessity say with *Sabellius*, as *Socinus* doth; that he is the vertue and efficacy; that is to say, a meer notional attribute of the Fathers God-head.

How the misunderstanding of Satisfaction and Imputation occasioned it.

In the mean time *Socinas*, excluding satisfaction by Christs Obedience, hath expressly excluded all imputation of it; being the immediate consequence of satisfaction; and the effect of it, in order of reason; but in nature and being, the same thing with it. Now it appears by the body of his Doctrine, that he had conceived a deep dislike of the opinion which I count Heresie; that placeth justifying Faith in believing a mans self to be predestinated to life from everlasting. And therefore under-

understood the imputation of Christs righteousness, as that opinion must needs understand it: Namely, that men are reconciled to God by the death of Christ, (their sins being pardoned before they be done, and they adopted to the Glory they shall one day have) without consideration to any condition qualifying for it: Which no man of common reason will take to be the sense of St. Bernard, or other learned Divines of the Church of Rome, that have allowed imputation of righteousness. And therefore it will be necessary to distinguish a two-fold sense in the imputation of Christs obedience, and the satisfaction which it followeth; to wit, according to the effect, to which it is thought that satisfaction is made, and imputed, or put to account. For in the opinion which I call Heresie, the merits of Christ are immediately imputed to them, for whom they were intended for righteousness and life everlasting. But in the Faith of Gods Church, Christs sufferings are immediately imputed to mankind: because in consideration of them, God declares himself ready to be reconciled with all that turn good Christians; and accordingly makes good the promise of his Gospel to them, performing their Christianity. So that in the sense which *Socinus* rejecteth; which is the sense of our Fanaticks; imputation as well as satisfaction, is immediate and personal; in the sense of the Church, mediate and real or causal; because it is immediately, to no further effect then of procuring the Gospel, to the effect of salvation, by the means of that Christianity which it requireth.

Had *Socinus* considered the consequence of this distinction, <sup>upon what grounds he is to be refused.</sup> he would never have put himself upon the task, of confining all that is said in the New Testament, of *Redemption*, *Reconciliation*, and *Propitiation* by Christ, and by his blood, to the effect of assuring us, that God will stand to the Gospel which he publisheth. He would never have wrested the signification of all sacrifices and types, figuring our Lord Christ and his death in the Old Testament to intend no more than the inducing of us to that Christianity which he preached, in confidence of that Grace which he for his obedience, is advanced to bestow. He would never have declared against the Faith of the Holy Trinity, out of a presumption, that the salvation of Christians is provided for; setting aside the God-head of our



Lord Christ, and the satisfaction, at which his obedience is valuable, in consideration of it. In fine, he would not have transgressed the Faith of the Church, had he understood it. But having before condemned the Pope for Antichrist, and the Papists for Idolaters, and derived this Apostacy of the Whole Church from the very death of the Apostles; no marvel that he would not be confined to the Faith of the Church, that he could not see the ground of it. No marvel that he oversaw the profession of the Faith of the Church, by being baptized, in the condition of our salvation; knowing that he transgressed the Rule of that Faith. No marvel that they who see him in the wrong, in refuting him and his followers, are sometimes worsted in a true cause; because they consider not that the punishment of Christ for our sins may so be understood, as to make the reward of Christianity due before, and therefore without, the performing of it. Whereas understanding his sufferings to concern immediately no particular mans person, but the common cause of mankind: The immediate effect thereof is the procuring of a new Law, for God to proceed with us by. Which Law being set on foot upon the fall of Adam, was first fully revealed by the Gospel of Christ: The Original Law, which man in his original uprightness was subject to, remaining still the Rule of Righteousness, according to those terms which the Gospel declareth: Though for the effect of taking vengeance on us, abrogated or dispensed with, in consideration of Christs obedience.

*The helps of  
Grace granted  
in consideration  
of Christs obe-  
dience.*

Now those helps of Grace which the Gospel tendreth for the undertaking and performing of that Christianity, which it requireth, are also granted in consideration of Christs merits, and sufferings, put to our account. That is, the helps of preventing Grace, or the actual motions of Gods Spirit, without which the Gospel were a meer abuse, supposing original sin; upon the common account of mankind: The helps of following Grace, or the habitual endowment of Gods Spirit, upon the personal account of him that is saved by Baptism. But both kinds presuppose that the coming of the second Adam was to repair the breach, which the first Adam had made. Both condemn the Heresie of *Pelagius*, which *Socinus*, in some Articles of it, reviveth. And indeed, to deny bodily death to be the

the effect of *Adams* sin, what is it else, but to deny the Resurrection of the flesh to be the effect of Christs righteousness? For though it is the power of his God-head that shall raise them again who shall raise to shame; yet if it be the Spirit of holiness, which raised Christ from the dead, that shall raise the mortal bodies in which it dwelt here, up to life; is it not the sin which the fall of *Adam* brought into the World, that first brought in death after it? The same Spirit of Holiness it is, that our Lord according to promise sent his Disciples in his own stead; and sent it with visible signs of his presence to make his word effectual in them first, and by them, to the conversion of the Nations. And this means, as no Christian can deny to be sufficient to oblige all the World to be Christians: So there can be nothing wanting on Gods part, to render it effectual with those that embrace it. For it is manifest, that the Grace of God works the conversion of all by shewing the World sufficient reason to be Christians. A thing which can by no means be done, but by shewing them, that they are the causes of their own damnation if they be not. They that are convicted hereof, it is sure, would be perswaded by concupiscence, not to act according to that conviction; were there no more then conviction of reason to turn the ballance. But when Gods Spirit manageth the motives of Christianity which it self provideth, (for this conviction consisteth in the works, whereby God hath made good the preaching of our Lord and his Apostles) what can be wanting to the efficacy of it? And this is signified in the Old Testament, by ascribing the conquest of the promised Land to God, and not to the strength or valour of his people. So that wheresoever we find that they are delivered out of their enemies hands by Gods assistance, there we are assured that the powers of darkness are not to be overcome by Christians, but by Gods Grace.

And the inclinations of mans heart to evil from the Mothers womb, the frailty of humane flesh, and the mortality thereof, are so expressly delivered in the Old Testament, that the Jews themselves do acknowledge the effect of *Adams* transgression in them. Neither is it possible to give any account of any necessity for the coming of our Saviour, otherwise. For whatsoever can be required to convict the world, that the tender  
of

*And therefore  
they infer  
Original Sin  
by the Fall of  
Adam.*

of the Gospel shall be made good to all that embrace or preserve it, might have been, as well without the death of the Son of God, as by it. Therefore the consent of the Church in this point hath been evidenced against *Pelagius*, not only by the custom of baptizing Infants, but by the Ceremonies which they were baptized with; signifying the ejecting of the evil Spirit, to make way for Gods Spirit. Not that it was a Law from the beginning, that all Children of Christian Parents should be baptized Infants. For it is evident, that they thought it better to be baptized at mans age. Because then they are more able to understand what they undertake. But because they never did presume of the salvation of any that died unbaptized. And therefore, since the world came to profess Christianity, and that the care and zeal, either of Parents or Ministers, could not so well be trusted for the preventing of death, by procuring Baptism for infants; especially with that reverence which the Sacrament requireth, it hath been agreed upon by the silent practise of Christendom, to baptize all while they are Infants. And this consent who so infringeth, in the overt act of Schism which he committeth, he involveth a presumption of Heresie against himself. For what could move a man to such an outrage, who did believe, that profession which saveth a Christian to include in it the Sacrament of Baptism?

*wherein the  
Covenant of  
Grace consisteth.*

And thus it remaineth evident, that it is a Covenant of unspeakable Grace on Gods part, which his Gospel bringeth; notwithstanding that it requireth, upon the condition of our Salvation, that we live and die Christians. First as tendering the assistance of Gods Spirit, as well to undertake as to perform: And then having performed, as tending a reward which our performance cannot challenge. And both in consideration of Christ, whose merits and sufferings are free, pure, meer Grace, before all helps of Grace which they have purchased for us.

*That the state  
of Grace is forfeited by heinous sin.*

It is a thing prodigious and deplorable to consider, that they who would be Reformers of the Church should, notwithstanding all this, think it no state of Grace that can become forfeit by sin. As if because without daily sin, Christians do not live; therefore that reconciliation with God were no reconciliation,

cilement, that can become void by grofs and heinous fin. But till that which hath been said of Justification, and that Faith which alone justifieth, be destroyed, there can be no pretense for so dangerous a doctrine. That which is granted upon a condition faileth with it. And it must be a secret which the Old and New Testament hath not revealed, that shall make good our title to Heaven, though we make not good that Christianity which it intitleth us to it. And therefore, when St. Paul is perswaded, that nothing shall *separate us from the love of God in Christ*, Rom. VIII. 28. he supposeth us to be such as he describeth all along the Chapter afore. Such as he found himself resolved to be: Such as live *not according to the flesh, but according to the Spirit*. Of such he might well be perswaded, that nothing should separate them from the love of God in Christ; knowing the helps of Gods All-sufficient Grace to be promised all that so live, not to fail till they receive them in vain. Whence St. John saith, *that he who is born of God sinneth not*, because the *Unction* which he hath from God *abideth in him, and teacheth him all things*, 1 John II. 20. 27. III. 9. he supposeth him that is born of God to be the Son of God; who shall be no Son of God, if he sins such sins as he means. And therefore he supposeth this *Unction to abide in him*; which abideth not in them that sin. When our Lord saith to the Samaritan, John IV. 14. *that who so drinketh of the water which he shall give, shall never thirst any more*; he supposeth that the water which he giveth is not vomited up again; he opposeth this water, so drunk, to the water of Jacobs Well, which did make room for thirst in time. Whereas this water, so drunk shall spring up to life everlasting. All Heresies have the superficial sound of some Texts of Scripture, to set against the whole stream of Scripture, and the current Doctrine of it. He that considers how much of the Old and New Testament, that which I have said of Justification involveth, will think it reason to measure the meaning of two or three Texts by that; not to rack all the rest to the length of these. As for the sense of the Church, seeing the consent thereof is evident in the condition upon which we are justified: It is a part of madness, for any man that believes the Unity thereof, to imagine that any Doctor that held with the Unity can be found to teach otherwise.

*The danger of  
the contrary  
Position according to the  
ground of it.*

wife St. *Augustine* is remarkable. The stress lies upon him : and upon those Books, the occasion whereof is to enquire how it comes to pass, that so many that had attained to the state of Gods Grace do not die in it.

But though I admire at the wilfulness with which this mistake is maintained, against all Christendom, Old and New, but those who follow *Calvin*: Yet I value the danger of it, to the Salvation of him that hath it, according to the opinion of Justification which it is joyned with. For if it come from an assurance of a mans Predestination: As if such a one being once justified, cannot incur the state of damnation by any sin; taking that opinion for an Heresie, I must needs take this for a Position destructive to Salvation. It is otherwise with those that make Repentance to go before justifying Faith. For it is true, that if a man have no ground that he is reconciled to God, till his first conversion; he can have no ground that he is reconciled to God of any sin that he falls into afterwards, till he have performed his Repentance. And therefore they contradict themselves, if they imagine that being actually in the state of damnation, a man may have that trust in God which justifying Faith signifies, before he turn from his sin by Repentance. But the worse Divines the better Christians. And the truth which they hold suffereth not the venom of that opinion, which is indeed inconsistent with the same, to operate.

CHAP.

## C H A P. XI.

*What Law of God it is, that may be fulfilled by a Christian. Of doing more than Gods Law requireth. Whether our Lord gave a New Law, or not. Of the Satisfaction and Merit of Christian Works. Original Sin is not Adams Sin imputed to his Posterity. Wherein Original Sin consisteth. What Original Righteousness signifieth. What good the Unregenerate are able to do by the Law of Nature.*

**B**Ut this resolution perfectly reconcileth two of those Controversies, which we have with the Church of *Rome* about Justification, and the points annexed to it: That of the possibility of fulfilling Gods Law, for a Christian: and that of *satisfying* for sin, and of *meriting* Grace or Glory, by the good works of a Christian. For it is certain, that the Law which God gave *Adam* in Paradise, as having created him in his Original Uprightness, can never be fulfilled, by the Grace which the death of Christ tendreth, in this bondage under Original Sin. But, if we speak of the New Law, which the Gospel of Christ enacteth, (*St. James* calleth it *the Law of liberty*; *St. Paul*, *the Law of the Spirit of life*) it is evident by the premises, that, if it be not fulfilled, then is Christ dead in vain: then do we receive his Grace in vain; and cannot be saved, but are still in our sins. For every covenant, every contract, is a Law to the parties. And though God need not contract with his creature, which he may give Law to at pleasure; yet if he condescend to treat and to contract with man, he

L

intends

*what Law of God it is, that may be fulfilled by a Christian.*



intends not to abuse him, by contracting for that which cannot come to effect. Therefore he doth not contract with him, upon condition that he shall not sin, who, born in Original Sin, sinneth daily; but upon condition, that if he fall into sin, he return by repentance: and blotting out his former sin, by works meet for repentance, proceed in newness of life for the future. And upon these terms, the Original Law of Righteousness in Paradise doth not become void; but continueth in force, for the regulating of the righteousness which Christians are to live by, and to aim at. Whether or no inhaunced, in consideration of that great Grace of God, *bringing Salvation to all*, which *hath appeared* by the Gospel; above that measure, which the Original Righteousness of Paradise required; I dispute not yet. But the Law of *Moses*, upon these terms, will be the reviving of the Original Law of Paradise, as to the effect of attaining and holding the Land of *Canaan*, (a figure correspondent, as well to the Earthly as to the Heavenly Paradise) by that outward obedience, which the Letter of the Ceremonial and Judicial Law required: And upon these terms, the Thief upon the Cross, dying in the state of Grace, fulfilled Gods Law; fulfilling all that, which the Covenant of Grace required of him for his Salvation in that estate. And if there be such a thing, as Repentance effectual to Salvation, upon the bed of death; which the Rules of the Church do not warrant us to presume of, though they oblige us not to despair of it; then he who is effectually converted to God, upon his last bed of death, hath fulfilled Gods Law.

*Of doing more  
than Gods Law  
requireth.*

As for going beyond the Law, by works of Supererogation; it is easie to see, that, according to the premises, he that cannot do what Gods Original Law requires, cannot do more. But it is as easie to see, that some circumstances may conduce to the performance of our Christianity, that are no part of it; and therefore the Vow of Baptism binds not to them. If Marriage stand with Christianity, what Christian is forbidden Marriage? Yet single life is the safer way to perfection in Christianity. So is the Profession of the Clergy, and all the means of further retirement from the World, than the taking up of Christs Cross signifies. And the Grace which our Lord, and St. Paul after him owns, in them that do this, is not a peculiar temper of the

the body, obliging him that hath it to live single, and him that hath it not, to marry; but a singular zeal, to wave that which God makes lawful for us, that we may the better come to his Kingdom. Which, when it proceeds with a single eye, proposing to it self nothing of this World, but the means of attaining to the World to come; well may we be assured of Gods help to perform it, by virtue of that promise which the common Christianity challengeth, intending nothing but the effect of it.

I do believe further, that we, who live under the Gospel, are tyed to a higher degree of goodness, than those who lived under the Law were; as for the condition of continuing in the state of Gods Grace. And that this is the best reason for many actions of holy persons, sometimes not condemned, sometimes commended in the Old Testament; which, notwithstanding, agree not with that perfection which our Lord, by his Sermon in the Mountain, preacheth; to wit, that either they were accepted by God in that estate, or at least, might stand with the state of his Grace. But this is not to say, that our Lord, by those Precepts which he there delivers, introduces a New Law, which obliged not under the Old Testament. For I have shewed, that under it the Fathers were saved as Christians; that is, by worshipping God *in Spirit and truth*. But that there was a twofold sense in *Moses Law*: And that by keeping it according to the Letter, they held the Land of Promise; according to the Spirit, though in a less measure than the Gospel requires, they attained the World to come.

*whether our  
Lord gave a  
New Law, or  
not.*

The Satisfaction and Merit of good Works done by Christians may be understood to be grounded, either upon their intrinsic value, or upon that mark which the Gospel of Christ stamps them with, in consideration of Christs Merits and Sufferings. But that intrinsic value at which they are valued, by those who make them worth life everlasting, upon terms of commutative Justice, rises upon the account of Gods Spirit, by the Grace whereof they are done. And the Grace of Gods Spirit is not granted, but in consideration of our Lord Christ, and his obedience. And therefore this intrinsic value is meerly imaginary, even in the opinion of them that advance it; unless they will needs contradict themselves. For the value of our Lords obedience is necessarily extrinsic to us; to whose ac-

*Of the Satisfaction and Merit of Christian works.*

## Just Weights

count it redoundeth, only by imputation of Grace. And therefore there is no intrinsic value of Christian works, supposing the Gospel to be that which I have said. For being performed by virtue of Gods Grace, they cannot be acceptable to the effect of salvation, but by the same Grace. But the *merit*, or the *satisfaction* which is ascribed unto them, being grounded upon that *Grace, bringing salvation to all, which hath appeared by the Gospel*; it is not possible to imagine, what it can derogate from the merits and satisfaction of our Lord Christ. It is true, men may forget their own grounds: as I have said that they do, who would have the works of Christians to merit Heaven upon terms of commutative Justice. And forgetting themselves, they may contradict themselves; ascribing that for debt, to them that do them, which is not due, but upon the account of Christs obedience. But still, the worse Divines the better Christians. For the truth which they profess, if they profess it not in vain, shall be an Antidote against that pride, destructive to the humility of a Christian, which the opinion of a mans own merit produceth. Whereas they who exclude all consideration of our works from the great trial of the Day of Judgment, do thereby exclude Christianity out of the heart, as they do the Creed out of the Church. Whereas they who suppose gross and heinous sins to be pardoned, before they see the fruits of Repentance in works of mortification, by extraordinary exercises of Devotion, with Fasting and Alms; do contribute as much as their allowance signifies to the murder of that soul, which might have been cured, had not their Authority made men believe that there needs no such cure. There is an Opinion crept into the Church of *Rome* on the other side, That imperfect sorrow for that sin, which by Confession is submitted to the Keys of the Church, serves to cure such sin, how great soever: And that Penance is enjoined, to redeem the debt of temporal punishment to be paid in *Purgatory*, if not here; as remaining due when the guilt is done away. Whereas the works of Mortification are but the exercise, and the performance of that contrition, which the Gospel requires to qualify a man for pardon of his sin. And therefore the Authority of the Church cannot supply the want of that condition, which the Gospel requireth in him that seeks forgiveness: but only procure

cure it by excluding him from the Communion, that shall refuse the cure which the Church prescribeth. Now this is an Opinion which that Church allows, but enjoyns not. And therefore, whether there be more danger there by this Opinion, or by the other extream, where all works of Mortification are cried down for Superstitious, I leave to the conscience of discreet Christians. The Catholick Church hath used the terms of *Satisfaction* and *Merit* in a true sense, and to a good purpose: and it were easie to shew, that the same sense is allowed, though not enjoyed by the Church of *Rome*, even since the Council of *Trent*, were this the place.

I have said, that the obedience of the Second *Adam* is not immediately imputed to any particular mans account; but first to the common account of Mankind, and to the account of particular persons, as they are qualified for it by being good Christians. And now I must say accordingly, that the disobedience of the first *Adam* is not imputed immediately to the damnation of any particular; but to the bondage of all his Posterity. For no man shall be condemned at the last Day, but for the works which he shall be found to have done in the body. And for what he shall then be condemned for, the same God decreed that he should be condemned from everlasting. So being become slaves to sin, we are ransomed by Christ. But as this ransom intitleth us not to life, till we embrace the terms of it; neither doth this bondage damn us, till we become parties to it by our sins. If this be true, then doth not Original Sin consist in the imputation of *Adams Sin* to his Posterity; as *Catharinus* held at the Council of *Trent* with great applause. And indeed I need not dispute, that God cannot in Justice punish one man for another mans sin; because you see the Posterity of the first *Adam*, according to the flesh, is punished for his sin no otherwise, than it is rewarded for the second *Adam*, and for his righteousness. The interest of our common Christianity is safe, so long as the necessity of Christs coming, and the reason of it, for the cure of the breach which *Adam* made, remains evident and unmoveable.

Nor is there any difficulty in resolving the nature of Original Sin, that should drive us to this novelty. All Sin is an act, or an habit, that faileth of that measure which Gods Law requires

*Original Sin is not Adams sin imputed to his Posterity.*

*wherein Original sin consisteth.*

quires. Original Sin hath only this peculiar, that giving the like inclination as other habits do, it is not contracted by custom, but by birth. Call this inclination to that which Gods Law forbiddeth, *Concupiscence*, and you have expressed the whole nature of Original Sin. For calling it *Concupiscence*, you make it to be the want of Original Righteousness; but you express over and above, what it is that succeedeth in Mankind, born in Original Sin instead of Original Righteousness; to wit, that disorder in our inclinations, which *Concupiscence* signifieth.

What Original  
Righteousness  
signifieth.

The Question only remains, Whether Original uprightness shall signifie only Innocence or supernatural Grace over and above? For it may be supposed, that Man was created at the first only to the happiness of this life, upon condition of living according to the Innocence in which he was created. And there are that have maintained this; though not denying, that God intended to reward this exercise of his Innocence with a call to an higher estate. The Fathers indeed are of another mind, moved perhaps by the mystery of Christ and his Church, which he discovereth in his marriage with his own flesh, *Gen. I. 24. Eph. V. 31.* For this seems to make Adam a Prophet endowed with Gods Spirit. But he that should not think it necessary, that Adam should understand the mystical sense of his own words, would not be tied to that consequence. In the mean time, the common Christianity, and the ground of salvation, seems to remain unmovable; granting, That by advancing the Covenant of Grace, which was set on foot in Paradise, so soon as God promised the seed of the Woman to dissolve the works of the Serpent, God calleth Mankind to an estate of supernatural Grace. And though it may be disputed, whether it could stand with the holiness of God; and the purity of his work, to have made Man in an estate of meer Nature; that is, subject to concupiscence, without supernatural Grace to restrain the effect of it; yet could it not stand with his Justice, creating man to supernatural happiness (and therefore liable to Damnation, transgressing the supernatural Righteousness which it must require) to create him without supernatural Grace, necessary to the performing of the said Righteousness.

To



To fortifie that which hath been said, I am not to omit that which *St. Paul* seemeth expressly to teach, *Rom. 11. 12. 16.* That they who are not under Gods positive Law, shall be judged at the last Day by the Law of Nature. Which if it be so, then shall they not be condemned for Original Sin. It is not necessary that Christianity should give account, why God thought good to suffer *Adam* to be seduced by the Apostate Angels, and *Mankind* to be born in bondage to sin; why he suffered the greatest part of it to be overcome with Idolatry, after he had set the Covenant of Grace on foot? It is enough, that he found it for his glory to give Sin this entrance into the World, which he meant to encounter with that Grace which his Gospel revealeth; leaving that which it revealeth not to be unfolded at the Day of Judgment. In the mean time, if they who know not Gods Law are judged by the Law of Nature; they are not judged by the Covenant of Grace, though given all Mankind in Paradise, because by corruption of sin they were grown strangers to it. Much less therefore, by the Original Righteousness of Paradise, supplied by the Covenant of Grace. Now the corrupt inclination of Concupiscence extinguisheth not the light of Nature, which by discovering the difference between that which is good, because it is honest, and that which is only pleasant or profitable, condemneth the neglect of that for either of these. Man is sensible of his own worth, and the wrong that he doth it, when he preferreth profit or pleasure before the obligation which it inferreth. And therefore there can no question remain, that he is able, notwithstanding Original Sin, to do that which is good for a right reason, and a good intent. For the reason of profit or pleasure doth not always drown and swallow up the reason of that which is just and honourable. Therefore he who makes not the World to come his end, may do that which is truly good for honesties sake, and the satisfaction of loving it as it deserveth. But because concupiscence, which the World is infected with, procureth daily occasions of opposition between right and interest; and those such as call in question the worldly estate of him that should resolve to prefer the right in all things; therefore is not the Natural man able to resolve upon God for the end of all his doings. His corrupt inclinations betray

What good the  
unregenerate  
are able to do  
by the Law of  
Nature.



## Just Weights

betray the Judgment, whereby he alloweth that which is best to the interest of his profit or pleasure. Now whether those actions which are done upon good grounds, and for a good purpose; but by a man that maketh not God the end of all his doings, are to be counted sins or not, I will not Dispute. Thus much appeareth, That they who are to be judged by the Law of Nature, do not always transgress the Law of Nature: For how should they be judged by that Law, which they cannot chuse but transgress?

## C H A P. XII.

*Upon what terms that which is possible may become future. The difference between necessity antecedent and consequent. The difference between freedom from necessity and from bondage. Freedom from necessity always requireth indetermination, not always indifference. The Object determineth the Will, saving the freedom of it. Whence the certainty of future contingencies ariseth. How this appears in the Scriptures. God no cause of sin, according to the Scriptures. Concerning the middle knowledge of God.*

*upon what terms, that which is possible may become future.*

**T**His being the estate in which the Gospel overtaketh Mankind, the Question concerning the concurrence of mans free will to the works of Gods free Grace is that which remains: and the resolving of it, lies in resolving, by what means, and upon what account that which is of it self only possible becomes future: How it becomes certain, that such a thing shall be, which of it self only may be. For that which is possible

ble and no more, is of it self a meer nothing : That which only may be is not. Only it signifies withal, that there is something that is able to reduce it to effect, or being. But that which is future signifieth here, not only τὸ μέλλον but τὸ γυνόμενον : not only that which as yet is not, but that which hereafter shall be : And that imports a certain being for that time. Seeing then that nothing can reduce it self to being ; the Question is, what it is that renders it certain to be, for the time when it shall be. For all that God can do is absolutely possible. And God can do whatsoever can be done. God cannot deny himself : And that he should do, if contradictories should be true ; or things that destroy one another subsist both at once. Accordingly, whatsoever God sees is certain, and God sees whatsoever shall be ; so whatsoever shall be is certain though we know not what it is. Now I have said, that it becomes not certain by any decree or motion of God, whereby he determines the will of man , and moves it to do whatsoever it doth , before it move or determine it self ; at least in order of nature. Priority in order of nature signifieth this , that the motion of free will doth necessarily depend, and shall necessarily follow upon the precedent determination and motion of God.

But things are said to be necessary two waies ; some are absolutely necessary ; the necessity whereof lies in their cause and the efficacy of it, which cannot be defeated. And in as much as every cause is before the effect : Therefore this necessity is called *Antecedent*. Some are necessary only upon supposition ; not of that which goes before, (for the cause which createth absolute necessity may be supposed) but of something that follows upon the being of any thing. As that which a man knows or sees to be of necessity is ; because he could not see it if it were not. And so whatsoever is in the world, of necessity is, because we suppose that it is. But this necessity is not in the thing, (speaking of contingencies) but in that consequence which the mind frameth, upon supposing it. And therefore it is called necessity *Consequent*, as the other *Antecedent*. It is not this consequent necessity that destroyeth freedom in the will, or contingency in the effects of it ; but the antecedent. For nothing is absolutely necessary but God : and that which God

*The difference between necessity Antecedent and Consequent.*

M

will

will have come to pass. And this necessity is the necessity of a cause that cannot be defeated; not implying any supposition of the effect which it produceth, but inferring the consequence of it. Therefore natural and antecedent, and destructive to freedom in the will, and contingency in the effect of it. And this is no more than I said afore, why there can be no absolute predestination to glory or to shame, according to the Gospel and Christianity; because it must come to effect by Gods determining and moving the will, to every step that it maketh toward life or death everlasting. And that will not stand with that free will which the Gospel supposeth.

*The difference  
between freedom  
from necessity  
and from  
bondage.*

For you may have observed a twofold freedom, by the premises. The Gospel supposeth mankind born in bondage to sin, and therefore supposeth not his will free from bondage. But supposing this, tenders him life everlasting, upon condition that he accept of the ransom, which Christ hath paid for him; and renouncing the bondage of sin, become free to God and his service. And this is an Act which his freewill must do, because it is the condition of that which God does in consideration of it. The consideration is the freedom with which it is done; which if were done of necessity, there could be no reason why God should either require or reward it. So there is a freedom from necessity, whereby mankind, though slave to sin by birth, embraceth that freedom from sin to righteousness which the Gospel tendereth; though not by the original motion of the will, (which is not in slavery unless it love the slavery which it is in;) yet by the free motion of it, being first moved by the Gospel to make use of the ransom. For I have shewed, that this motion bringeth with it sufficient help of Gods Grace, to do that which it requireth.

*Freedom from  
necessity always  
requireth inde-  
termination,  
not always in-  
difference.*

This freedom then, from necessity, doth not always require indifference in the will that useth it. For that is properly, only when the will is ballanced, not inclining any more to do then not to do, this rather then that. But it requireth that it be never determined till it determine it self. For it availeth not to say, that that freedom which God gave man when he made him was, to do freely whatsoever God should determine him to do freely; as other things necessarily do that which God determineth them to do necessarily. Freedom and the use of freedom

dom is Gods gift. But God cannot give freedom by taking it away: nor maintain freedom by destroying it. No more can he cause the will to do that freely, which he determineth it to do necessarily, before it determine it self. Nor is there any fear of making the creature God, if we make it able to do that which God enableth it to do, without other helps then the ability which he giveth it. For what is that ability, that enableth not to do that which it maketh a man able to do? It is a riddle when it is not understood. It is a contradiction when it is understood. The ability which God giveth, issueth from him, as from the Fountain of all ability, every moment of time, which one and the same standing moment of eternity answereth. So the creature cannot act but by the ability which God issueth: And therefore continueth Gods creature, as depending upon God, in that which it doth, no less then in that which it is. If therefore the will of man cannot act freely by virtue of any motion of Gods, determining it to act, before it determineth it self; then must it act freely, by virtue of that power which God giveth it every moment to determine it self.

True it is, that being the will of a reasonable creature, it cannot determine it self, till it be determined, *in the nature of an object*, by a reason, carrying an appearance of that which is best for the present. But because that appearance changeth from moment to moment; therefore the determination of the object is never peremptory, till you suppose the will to act according to it. And therefore, though it be necessary that the will act according to the last dictate of the understanding; yet is this necessity but upon supposition that it is the last: And that because you suppose that the will proceedeth to act, without employing further consideration upon the object. So the appearance of good in the object, and the ability of embracing it in the will, serve to make good the freedom of choise in humane actions. But the certainty of it from everlasting must be ascribed to the incomprehensible wisdom of God, comprehending all appearance of good, which all men may be moved with, at all times and the effect, which the present disposition of every will shall allow every motion, at every moment. Now providence must needs appoint, from everlasting, what appearance of good every

*The Object determineth the will, saving the freedom of it.*

will shall be moved with every moment ; by resolving, what occurrence of objects every reason shall be presented with, in that estate which it setteth every man in, for every moment. And upon these terms, the foreknowledge of humane actions in God must needs be infallibly certain; saving as well the freedom of the will, as the contingency of the things which it doth. For comprehending, first the present disposition of every will: and the effect of every motion that is possible upon it; then not only how it shall be actually moved, but also that it shall not be moved otherwise; how should he fail to comprehend what it will determine, while it might determine otherwise.

whence the  
certainty of fu-  
ture contingen-  
cies ariseth.

And that this is the true and due way that we are to hold, in reasoning of Gods Counsels, appears by the whole tenor of the Scriptures speaking of God in the language of the children of men; as the Jews Doctors speak. It pleaseth God not only to deal with man about his salvation, but to treat with him in his own Language; because he is not able to understand God otherwise. It is not possible for us to understand the wisdom of God otherwise, then according to the wisdom of man; as proceeding, by deliberation to resolution; though we know very well all the while, that the simple and indivisible essence of the Godhead is that, into which all variety of his Decrees, which the Scripture obligeth men to order, must resolve. Now the Scripture representeth God to us, every where, as taking the rise and the ground of his Counsels, and proceedings from that which he seeth in the thoughts and dispositions of the men, whom he ordereth. The instance is remarkable, and unavoidable, which you have in the whole course of his bringing the People of Israel out of *Egypt*, and the destroying of *Pharaoh* and his people, for the hardness of their hearts, which he foresaw, would not let them obey his message, and release his people. The like you have in the raising up enemies unto *Solomon*, for his sin: and the dividing of the ten Tribes from his posterity. So in the destruction of *Ahab*, and the representation of Gods Counsel, and Proceeding in it, which the prophet *Micah* declares before hand to his face. So in the Crucifying of our Lord, and the means whereby it was brought to pass, according to the Counsel of God which the Scripture declareth.

True

True it is, there be divers passages in Scripture, which seem to signifie a will in God, that such men should sin, as he hath determined to destroy; the Sons of *Eli* for example, neglecting their Fathers advice, *because God had resolved their ruine.* But seeing it is so plentifully expressed, in other Book cases of the Scriptures, that such mens resolutions came not from the immediate motion of God, determining them to that which they do; but from the considerations, which their own precedent wickedness was ensnared with; all reason of Religion requires, that the like considerations be supposed, in those cases wherein they are not expressed. As that the Sons of *Eli* were not determined by God to sin, because he had resolved to destroy them; but that for their sins which went afore, he tendered them the advice of their Father, which he foresaw they would sin by neglecting; that is, he suffered them to sin further, to their own ruine. A thing so manifest in the cases of *Pharoah* and *Judas*, that whose shall stumble at the hardning of *Pharoahs* heart, must thank himself for the fall which he takes by that offense.

*How this appears in the Scriptures.*

The Scripture expresseth further, that if *Saul* had come to *Keilah*, the men of the City would have delivered *David* into his hands. And that if our Lord had done those miracles in *Tyre* and *Sidon*, which he did in *Corazin* and *Bethsaida*, they would have repented, in sackcloth and ashes. Not as if the preaching of the Gospel, or the miracles which assure the truth of it, were Grace sufficient; but because the Spirit by which our Lord spoke and wrought miracles, was present with the words and with the works, which he used as means and instruments, to convert his hearers. And therefore are to be supposed by virtue of Gods promise, when they are not expressed. The Book of Wisdom affirmeth, in like manner, that God foresaw the impenitence of the *Egyptians*, notwithstanding all *Moses* his miracles. These passages affirm expressly, that God foreknows what man would do, if he were in any estate possible; though indeed he never come into that state. But this is to be understood according to the incomprehensible wisdom of God; comprehending all appearances which a man should be moved with, in that estate: Not according to that which man can understand or express of any mans case, in any estate.

*God no cause of sin, according to the Scriptures.*

For



For all that we can comprehend is never able to render the event certain, that is but contingent; and to translate the effect from *possible* to *future*; which the wisdom of God, comprehending all things, can do. And this is that which some call the *middle knowledge* of God: To wit between the knowledge of all that is possible, and all that is future; whereby God knowing what man would do in this or that estate, resolves in what estate his providence shall set him, every moment of his life: And thereby foresees what he will do, in every case. And between this opinion, and the other of *predetermination*, I have always found this difference; that this perhaps is subject to more difficulty, then the understanding of man can comprehend or his words declare; that only subject to one inconvenience; that it rooteth up all Religion and Civility both at once, by destroying freedom in mans will, and contingency in the effects of it.

### CHAP. XIII.

*No absolute Predestination to Glory. Predestination to Grace, absolute. How Glory is the end of Grace. In what terms the Faith of the Church standeth, as concerning this point.*

No absolute  
Predestination  
to Glory.

HERE remains no more but to conclude; that though Gods Predestination to Glory or to shame cannot be absolute, yet his Predestination to *effectual* Grace, or to that which is only *Sufficient*, is and must be absolute. If Gods predestination to Glory and to shame were absolute, without consideration of that for which it is executed in time; there could be no ground for any exhortation, any advice, any perswasion, moving any man to perform any part of that Christianity which he professeth. There would be always a peremptory bar to all such applications: That what God hath appointed shall come to pass

pass, whatsoever a man shall do or endeavour to do. For it would not serve the turn to say; that if God have appointed the end, he hath appointed the means to effect it: And that this means is mans endeavours. Because if God have appointed the end to come by the means of that which a man is moved to do, then shall he do it, whether he endeavour to do it or not. For if it be said that he hath appointed it to come to pass by mans endeavours; then is not Gods decree absolute, because it must suppose mans endeavours. And indeed an absolute decree of predestination cannot come to effect, but by decrees, determining and moving mans will to that, which the bringing of it to effect requireth, before the will determine or move it self. And that is destructive to freedom in the will, and contingency in the effect of it.

On the other side, if the certainty of Gods foreknowledge, *Predestination*, and the Infallibility, or indefeasibleness of his providence stand upon a decree of placing every man at every moment of his life in such an occurrence of objects, inward and outward, with his disposition, who is moved by them to do or not to do this or that, as he sees will be effectual to resolve him upon that which he doth; then are the helps of Grace effectual and the effect of them certain upon the like decree. Which there is nothing in man to oblige God to make: And therefore it is his absolute will that maketh it. *to Grace absolute.* For the intent of sending Christ, for the redemption of mankind, inferreth no declaration, that God will do all that is in his power to do, that it may be to effect, if man refuse it not. It is enough, that he accompanieth the Gospel with his Spirit, when it cometh: In the mean time, that he trusteth his Church with the bringing of it. This justifieth his will. that all men should be saved; though they who never hear of it, for reasons which the Gospel declareth not, have not the refusing of it. Whereby it appears that the Authors of divisions in the Church are to answer for the souls that perish, for want of knowing the Gospel; which the divisions of the Church are the greatest means that hinders them to know. Now this decree proceedeth upon a supposition of freedom in the will, and the maintainance of it, by Gods continual government of all things; and therefore allows ground for all applications, moving to perform the Christianity which

which we profess. For though all that comes to pass is certain by Gods decree that cannot fail; yet that decree is not immediate, but supposeth mans will to move of it self; when his reason is moved by appearance of good in the object. And therefore it cannot be alledged in bar to any wholsom exhortation or advice. And although all that is thus decreed must needs come to pass; yet the necessity thereof is only *consequent*, upon a supposition, that the will determines it self freely; which being supposed, the consequence is certain, that it shall come to pass. Whereas the necessity of that which God determineth the will to act; lying in the determination and motion of the cause, which is God, that cannot fail; is *antecedent* to the effect, and destroys the freedom of the will, and the contingency of that which it doth.

*How Glory is  
the end of  
Grace.*

If it be said, that the end is intended before the means; and therefore he that is absolutely predestinated to effectual Grace (which includes perseverance untill death) must needs be absolutely predestinated to Glory, which is the end of Grace? The answer is, The Glory of him that is saved is not the end of Gods Grace; that is, of his gracious purpose, to give those helps which shall bring a man to Glory. Gods Grace is God, and Gods Glory is God: And God can have no end but God; and the glorifying of him that is saved is not the means to glorify God, till you suppose him qualified as the Gospel requireth. And therefore it is not absolutely the end of that Grace which effecteth it, till you suppose that it rendreth him so qualified. The means by which a man comes to Glory, if you take them as granted in such consideration, and rewarded in such measure as the Gospel alloweth, are the means of Gods Glory; otherwise they make not his Glory to appear, and therefore are not intended by him to that purpose. Indeed God hath made salvation the end of mankind, by the work of Redemption, as well as of Creation. But he hath not made it his own end, nor the means to it, but upon those terms which the Gospel declareth. All this is manifest by the damnation of those that are not saved. For though it be their final estate, yet it is not their end, because salvation is the end of all mankind; which were it Gods end, as it is mans end by Gods appointment, then should they also be saved. For God cannot fail of his end.  
Therre-

Therefore is not the damnation of him that is not saved, the end why God appoints him those means by which he shall come to that final estate. For it is not the means to Gods end, that is his Glory, till you suppose the man qualified as the Gospel alloweth: and so consider'd by God, when he appoints him the means that bring him to his last estate. In fine, mans Glory is not Gods end in giving Grace; though it be the end of the Grace which he giveth. Gods Glory is the only end as well of the Grace, as of the Glory which God giveth. Gods Glory is the end of effectual Grace. For God intendeth the effect which his Grace attaineth. And effectual Grace is a fit mean to glorifie God; implying mans compliance with Gods help. As for the helps of Grace in general, whether effectual or only sufficient; though Mans glory be the end of them, and that by Gods appointment, yet it is none of Gods end; because it is not the mean to Gods Glory, till it be supposed that they are used as they should be. And therefore God doth not appoint any man to Glory, till he see that he hath used his Grace as he should do. But he appointeth Grace without such respect; because there is no condition on mans part to render it due.

And herewith agreeth the Faith of Gods Church. It is well known, that St. *Austins* Writings against *Pelagius* were excepted against, (as introducing fatal necessity, and excluding the Will of God for the salvation of Mankind,) in the parts of *Gaul*; namely, by the Monastery of *Lerins*, the Clergy of *Marseilles*, and *Genoa*, and divers notable Persons in *Provence*. But not generally. For St. *Austin* being advertised hereof, by the Letters of *Prosper* and *Hilary* yet extant, defended himself by his Books *de Predestinatione & gratia*, and *de Perseverantia Sanctorum*. The Book which *Sirmondus* the Jesuite lately published under the name of *Prædestinatus*, is of the same date; premising a Catalogue of Heresies unto *Nestinus*, and making the last to be this of Predestination, which he refuteth. And indeed, in a Council or two under *Patens* Bishop of *Lions*, one *Lucidus* a Priest was forced to recant certain Articles of that sense. But *Fausus*, Bishop of *Reys* in *Provence*, being trusted by those Councils to draw up a defence of their decree; seem'd to fall within the consequence of some of *Pelagius* his Positions.

In what terms  
the Faith of the  
Church standeth,  
as concerning  
this Point.

N

And

And thereupon followed a Rescript of Pope *Celestine* to the Bishops of *Gaul*, yet extant; asserting the Doctrine of St. *Austin* in divers Articles, though without condemning any persons of the other side. The Second Council of *Orange* afterwards, with the Authority of the See of *Rome*, decreed against the said Articles. But no less against Predestination to death, or to sin: And without condemning either *Faustus*, or *Gennadius*, or *Vincentius*, or their Writings. And therefore they can no more be counted *Semi-Pelagians* for a Sect, than the other side *Predestinarians*. For this new Decree superseding the former, united the parties, and have been ever since in force in the West. The stirrs that were afterwards under *Carolus Calvus* upon the same ground, in the cause of the Monk *Godeschalvus*, cannot be thought to have made any alteration in it; because there were Prelates against Prelates, Churches against Churches, and Synods against Synods in the cause. Always that Council decreed nothing for St. *Austin*, against the Redemption of all Mankind, and the Will of God that all be saved. And *Prosper* his Apologist, (and the Author *de Vocazione Gentium* much more) writing about the same time, have asserted both. Condemning thereby the late zeal of *Jansenius* for St. *Austin*, (if not his hatred of the Jesuites) who thinking to overbear all Dispute in the point by his Authority and Reasons, hath not been afraid to maintain him in those Articles. And therefore hath given the Dominicans, whom his Opinion seems to comply so much with, just occasion to joyn themselves against him with the Jesuites. But his Opinion will prove a *nihil dicis*. That of *Arminius*, as it necessarily opposes absolute Predestination to Glory, so it stands very well with absolute Predestination to Grace; because it derives the Efficacy of Grace from that *Congruity*, which, as Gods foresight discovers, so his Providence uses. And therefore the discreetest of his Adversaries at the Synod of *Dort*, the *English*, and those at *Breme*, owned the Redemption of Mankind, and the Will of God that all be saved. Those that will not do the same must resolve upon Predetermination. And that, I grant, is not destructive to Christianity in the Dominicans, though of it self it be destructive; because holding Free will, they contradict themselves in it, and so have an Antidote against it. But in our Fanaticks,

ticks, that take Justifying Faith to be the assurance of Predes-  
tination, and the Covenant of Grace a meer Promise of God  
to those that have that assurance; it is downright Heresie. And  
though the Presbyterians do not profess to hold it, yet so long  
as they distinguish not themselves from the Fanaticks, but Com-  
municate with them, they will be Hereticks themselves, by  
the perpetual Rule of the Church, which makes them Here-  
ticks to the Church that Communicate with Hereticks, and  
Schismaticks that Communicate with Schismaticks.

# C H A P. XIV.

*Duty of a Christian as a Christian, and as a  
Member of the Church. How Anabaptists  
deny the Faith; how they are to be reconcil-  
ed with the Church. Their Errour in re-  
baptizing for want of dipping. What con-  
cerns Salvation in the Sacrament of the Eu-  
charist. How the Elements are consecrated  
into the Body and Blood of Christ, according to  
Gregory Nyssene. The consequence hereof  
in the Errours concerning the Eucharist.  
How the Eucharist a Sacrifice, and yet no  
ground for private Masses. The Eucharist,  
not the Sermon, the Chief Office of Gods  
service.*

**I** Fit be part of a mans Christianity to be a Member of Gods Church, then is a Christian sometimes concerned as a Christian; sometimes as a Member of the Church. For that which

*Duty of a Chri-  
stian as a Chri-  
stian, and as a  
Member of the  
Church.*



cerns him as a Member of the Church, arises from the Constitution of the Church, as the effect of that Power which God hath endowed his Church with. Whereas that which concerns him as a Christian, concerns him before the being of the Church; though the consent of the Church in it be the means to bring it into evidence. Whatsoever is necessary to be known for the salvation of all Christians, is of this kind: And whatsoever proceedeth from the Power of the Church, as the effect of it, is not necessary to be known for the salvation of all Christians. It is necessary for all Christians to know, that they are to live and die Members of Gods Church; and therefore to conform themselves to the Order of it. But that this Order is for the best, it neither concerneth them to know nor to enquire; provided it be sufficient for the salvation of all, and enjoyn nothing destructive to the salvation of any. This is the next obligation to that which concerneth a Christian as a Christian.

*How Anabaptists deny the Faith; how they are to be reconciled with the Church.*

The Sacraments of Baptism and of the Eucharist were instituted by our Lord in person, before he left the World. So was also the Power of the Keys, consisting in admitting to them, and excluding from them. Upon this Power he founded his Church; leaving the forming of it to his Apostles, whom he trusted it with by virtue of the same. It seems therefore that these Sacraments concern Christians as Christians, and not only as Members of the Church. I have shewed how Baptism concerns the salvation of all Christians. Whereby it appears, what presumption of Heresie there is in the Sect of the Anabaptists. For did they think the profession of Christianity to be the condition, in consideration whereof all that are baptized are saved; they could not take that Baptism of the Church for void, whereby there can be no doubt, that a Christian is obliged to the profession of a Christian. Because they believe not the condition of salvation to be the Covenant of Baptism, therefore they make it void, being received before knowledge. Whereas the greater question is, whether the Church be obliged to take their Baptism for Baptism, or not. For though the School make good all Baptism ministred in due matter and form of words; yet the Church never declared this general Reason, why it alloweth the Baptism of those  
Here-

Hereticks, whom it did not rebaptize, because they were Baptized with the due form of words ; but only appointed such and such Hereticks to be baptized, (as voiding the Baptism which they received from Hereticks) others to be received with Imposition of hands. Now of those Heresies whose Baptism the Church alloweth to be valid, though unlawful, none did ever question the Article of *one Baptism for remission of sin*; which they that own that Christianity for the condition of salvation do destroy. So did the *Gnosticks*; and their Baptism ought to be void. They who agree in their opinion, (though not in the grounds of it) how is the Church tyed to allow their Baptism? But because the Church is not tyed to make it void, and to baptize them again, returning to the Profession of the true Faith: Let it suffice, that it appeareth hereby how necessary this sound Profession is for the restoring, not only of Anabaptists, but of all other Sects that distinguish not themselves from them, to the Church.

They have indeed another pretence for rebaptizing. For that they may dip the whole body, they will leave the Church to Baptize in Rivers. Would they do this, did they think the Profession which is made with a good Conscience to be that which saveth in Baptism, as the Apostle teacheth? The order of this Church requireth dipping, *so it be warily done*; and certainly, if it be not the cleansing of the flesh, it is not the endangering of life that saveth. Now when sprinkling is used instead of dipping, without regard to the danger of the Child, in regard to a wrong Opinion in the point, or to the causeless tenderness of Mothers and Friends, especially of the Woman-kind; though the Sacrament be not void, not being ministred as it ought to be, the offence is given by him that so ministreth it.

*Their Error in  
re-baptizing for  
want of dipping.*

As the performance of Christianity is necessary for the Salvation of him, that first attained the state of Salvation by undertaking Christianity: so is the Sacrament of the Eucharist necessary for the Salvation of him, that is come to the state of Salvation by the Sacrament of Baptism. Which if it be true, then is it necessary for the Church to profess, and for all Christians to know and believe, That the benefit of the Eucharist depends upon the sincerity of that resolution, wherewith he that

*What concerns  
Salvation in  
the Sacrament  
of the Eucharist.*

that receiveth it stands to his Christianity: And on the other side, that so doing he fails not of the *Body and Blood of Christ* in that Sacrament; and by consequence, of *his Spirit* which it conveyeth. If therefore the Unity of the Church be a part of the common Christianity, then it is necessary to this effect, that it be celebrated in the Unity of Gods Church. For otherwise no man need to argue that it is void, that it is celebrated and received to no effect; seeing it is celebrated and received to so bad effect, as to make all that come to it *guilty of Christs Body and Blood*.

*How the Elements are consecrated into the Body and Blood of Christ, according to Gregory Nyssene.*

I claim further, that seeing it can be no sound part of Gods Church, that observeth not all the Laws of Gods Whole Church; if the Eucharist be not consecrated by that means, by which the Church from the beginning hath always consecrated the Eucharist, then it is not celebrated in the Unity of Gods Church. Now I conceive, I have shewed, that the Church from the beginning, did not pretend to consecrate by these bare words, *This is my Body, this is my Blood*, as *Operatory* in changing the Elements into the Body and Blood of Christ; but by that Word of God, whereby he hath declared the Institution of this Sacrament, and commanded the use of it: And by the execution of this command. Now it is executed, and hath always been executed by the Act of the Church, upon Gods Word of Institution, praying, that the Holy Ghost coming down upon the present Elements, *may make them the Body and Blood of Christ*. Not by changing them into the nature of flesh and blood; as the Bread and Wine, that nourished our Lord Christ on earth, became the Flesh and Blood of the Son of God, by becoming the Flesh and Blood of his Manhood, *hypostatically* united to his Godhead, saith St. Gregory Nyssene; but *immediately* and *ipso facto*, by being united to the Spirit of Christ, that is, his Godhead. For the Flesh and Blood of Christ by *Incarnation*, the Elements by *Consecration*, being united by the Spirit, that is, the Godhead of Christ, become both one *Sacramentally*, by being both one with the Spirit or Godhead of Christ, to the conveying of Gods Spirit to a Christian.

*The consequence hereof, in the Errours concerning the Eucharist.*

This Doctrine of St. Gregory Nyssene, grounded upon the form of Consecrating used by the Whole Church, seems to me, to make good all that the Ancient Fathers have taught concerning

ing this Sacrament; whereas no other terms are able to do the same. And that without entering into any dispute concerning the substance of the Elements; but securing first that which the common Salvation requireth in the Sacrament, to wit, the receiving of the Flesh and Blood of Christ by it; by imputing the presence of them to the Consecration, not to the Faith of him that receives; it condemns the Error of *Transubstantiation*, making the change mystical and immediate, upon the coming of Gods Spirit to the Elements, the nature of them remaining; but it condemns *Consubstantiation* for no less. For what needs the Flesh and Blood of Christ fill the same dimensions, which the substance of the Elements possesseth, both being united with his Spirit? And truly they that invite the *Lutherans* to their Communion, professing *Consubstantiation*, must not make *Transubstantiation* an Error in the Foundation of Faith, if they will weigh by their own Weights, and mete by their own Measures. But if the Error of the Fanaticks, when they make the assurance of a mans Predestination to be Justifying Faith, be an Error in the Foundation of Faith; as I have shewed that it is; then it is an Error in the Foundation of Faith, to take the Eucharist to be a meer sign to confirm that Faith: And the Flesh and Blood of Christ to be present in the Eucharist, not by the Faith of the Church, whereby the Consecration is made and done, but by this Faith in him that receives. And therefore this Error being enough to render the Sacraments no Sacraments which are celebrated, professing it; the Word no word of God, that teacheth to celebrate such Sacraments; the Churches no Churches that profess it, or communicate with them that profess it; my Inference is unavoidable, That to justify this Church a Member of Gods only true Church, they ought not to be re-admitted into it, without expressly acknowledging *The Christianity which we undertake by the Sacraments of Baptism, to be the condition of the Covenant of Grace.*

If the consecrated Elements be the Flesh and Blood of Christ, then are they *the Sacrifice* of Christ crucified upon the Cross. For they are not the Flesh and Blood of Christ as in his body, while it was whole; but as separated by the passion of his Cross. Not that Christ can be sacrificed again: For a Sacrifice,

*How the Eucharist a Sacrifice, and yet no ground for private Masses.*

fice, being an Action done in succession of time, cannot be done the second time being once done; because then it should not have been done before: but because the Sacrifice of Christ crucified is *represented, commemorated, and applied*, by celebrating and receiving the *Sacrament*, which is that *Sacrifice*. They of the Church of *Rome*, that would make the breach wider than it is, do but justify the Reformation by forcing any other reason of a Sacrifice out of the Scripture, expounded by the consent of Gods Church. And they which stumble at the *Altar* and the *Priesthood*, which this Sacrifice inferreth, plainly they invite us to renounce the Whole Church of God, with the Church of *Rome*, for their sakes. And how much Christianity they will leave us, when that is done, who will undertake? Thus much for certain, upon these terms the virtue of this Sacrifice is not to be applied by the secret and private intent of the Priest, directing his action to the benefit of living or dead, whether present or absent; whether concurring to the celebrating and receiving of it, or not so much as thinking themselves concerned so to do. It is not applied, but by the devotion of them, who either receive it when they are bound to receive, or concur to the celebrating of it when they are not; whether Priests or People. And therefore there is no ground for private Masses, by granting the Eucharist to be in this nature a Sacrifice.

*The Eucharist,  
not the Sermon,  
the Chief Office  
of Gods Service.*

But can any man say, that it is not the principal Office of Christian Assemblies? That it ought not to be frequented, upon all the chief occasions for the Assemblies of Gods Church? That the ordinary work for which we meet all Lords days, and other days, (if on other days we ought ordinarily and solemnly to meet) is a Sermon, with an arbitrary Prayer before or after it? That they who take the pains to minister the same, are to be excused of celebrating the Eucharist, or ministering the Prayers of the Church, which it is to be celebrated with: (unless it be three or four times a year) and much more of reading the Scriptures, or praising God upon  *Davids* Psalter, and the Hymns of the Church? I confess *Calvins* Reformation is much after that form. And all the art of the Blessed Reformation here pretended, hath been to impose it for a Law upon this Kingdom, without once pleading that it is for the best. But  
so

to grossly prejudicial to the Service of God, and the Common Christianity, that it were injurious to fear, that a Christian Kingdom can suffer such an Imposture; derogating far more from the perpetual Custom of Gods Whole Church, than it can from the present Law of this Kingdom. That therefore I may make way to the determining of that which remains most questionable among us; what is the best form of Service, which the Church of *England* can worship God with, I must in the first place lay down that Rule, by which all Reformation of Laws Ecclesiastical is to be directed; together with the ground of it.

C H A P. XV.

*The ground that determines the Form of our Service. The Offices, of which the Service is to consist. Of the Use of the Psalms. Of Reading the Scriptures commonly called Apocrypha. What Preaching it is that the Scripture commendeth. There may be Preaching without Sermons, and Sermons without Preaching. The difference between the second Service in the Ancient Church, and our Communion Service. The general Preface, and the Prayers of the Church at the Eucharist. The Prayer of Oblation instituted by St. Paul, and the matter of it. The Lords Prayer at the Eucharist. The Place for the Common Prayers.*

**T**hat ground upon which the form of our Service is to be determined, is to determine all that remains to be determined

*The ground that determines the Form of our Service.*



mined in matter of Religion, by Law of this Kingdom. The true sense of the Scripture is not to be had, but out of the Records of Antiquity; especially of Gods ancient People first, and then of the Christian Church. The obligation of that sense upon the Church at this time, is not to be measured against the Primitive practice of the Whole Church. The Reformation of the Church is nothing but the restoring of that which may appear to have been in force, especially since Christianity hath been protected by the Laws of the Empire; because the greatest difference between the Primitive time of Christianity and this, is the difference between the state of Persecution, and of Protection by the Law of this Kingdom. It is therefore necessary that both sides, professing the Reformation, should agree upon the true ground of Reformation; and so upon the Rule which that ground will maintain and evidence; that is, to submit all that is in question to the visible practice of the Primitive times, before those abuses were brought in, which the Reformation pretendeth to restore. For if God have founded a Visible Church, which all this supposes, then cannot the Pope be Antichrist, nor the Church of Rome Idolaters, for any thing which the practice of the Primitive Church justifieth. And seeing the Church is Visible by the Laws of it, there can no Church be visibly one with that which was from the beginning, but by ruling it self by the same Laws, so far as the state of the Bodies for which they are made is the same. That which shall be said concerning the Form of our Service, is an instance hereof. The sense of the Scriptures, which hath been alledged, shall appear to agree with the Primitive order of Gods Church. The reviving of the Order is the point of Reformation in this particular; allowing for avoiding just offence in altering the Law of the Kingdom, without necessary cause, as the wisdom of Superiours shall find requisite.

*The Offices, of  
which the Ser-  
vice is to con-  
sist.*

I must now suppose, that the Offices of Gods Service, for which the Church of God assembleth ordinarily and solemnly, are the Praises of God, the instruction of the People in the duties of their Christianity, (whether by reading the Scriptures, or by handling the same.) and lastly, the Common Prayers of the Church; especially those which the Eucharist is to be celebrated

brated with. And this Order, which I put them in here, is that which the Church, from the beginning, hath always observed.

The Psalter of *David*, in the first place, hath been so generally frequented by the Whole Church, for the Instrument to of the use of the Psalms. make the Praises of God sound forth, that it ought not now to be questioned, (as questioned it is visibly enough) by any that would pretend to be of Gods Church. The order of reading the Psalms, which the Law of this Kingdom requires, is admitted, because they are part of the Scripture. But all endeavours used, that no devotion of the People be exercised by it. The Psalms in Rhime must engross that. We have seen a Civil War, in the time whereof these Psalms in Rhime, being crowded into the Church by meer sufferance, and so used without order of Law; have been employed on both sides to brand the adverse party with the marks, which the Psalms set upon the enemies of *David*, and of Gods People; that is, of Christ and of Christians; more freely by them, who sang them at the Head of their Armies, to that purpose. I hope those ways do not please at present; and therefore say freely, that the disorder ought not to continue. Some of our Fanaticks, I know, have torn them out of their Bibles. They thought themselves not concerned in them, though *David* were. The Jews, though they allow many of them to belong to the *Messias*, would not have them belong to our Lord Christ. But the Church uses them, supposing them all fulfilled in Christ and Christians; whether particular Souls, or the body of his Church. Upon this account they are the exercise of Christian Devotions: But not the Psalms in Rhime. The musick of them hath proved too hard for the People to learn in an hundred years. And yet no way more commendable than the Rhimes themselves are; and repeating a little in much time. The Tunes used in Cathedral and Collegiate Churches are easie to learn, and serve that Order which Law fetleth for Devotion, not for reading them as Scripture.

The Order for reading the Scripture appears necessary by the Jealousies of this time. For were it arbitrary, how obvious would it be, to deprave publick or private proceedings by of reading the Scriptures commonly called, Apocrypha. Lessons chosen on purpose? That the Books called *Apocrypha* are

## Just Weights

are not the Writings of Prophets inspired, is agreed. Though those Writings are properly called *Apocrypha*, which the Church authorizeth not to be read. Whereas these being always read in the Church, are therefore properly called *Ecclesiastical* by *Raffinus*. The chief Objections against them resolve into some passages, that seem not to agree with the Doctrine of the New Testament: But so, that the like are found in the Old. The Fact of *Razias*, the Proceeding of *Judith*, the Lye of *Tobias* Angel, are the greatest blocks of offence; not considering the Fact of *Jael*, or that of *Samson*, or the Lyes that seem to be rewarded under the Law. If offence be taken at them, why not at these? But it is no offence to good Christians, because good Christians do not presume the Law and the Gospel to be both one. And therefore are content to know their duty under the Gospel; letting that which agreeth not therewith in the Old Testament, pass without offence. In the mean time it is evident, that the Doctrine of Christianity beginneth to be discovered in them more clearly, than it stands discovered in the Law and the Prophets. Hereupon the Wisdom of the Primitive Church employed them for the instruction of the *Catechumeni*, that were yet but Learners of Christianity. And therefore, we are to insist upon the use of them, for edification of the Church, in the better understanding of the manners and good works of Christians; much abated by those who would put these Books to silence. But the whole Church having always used them; to lay them aside now, were not to restore the Church, but to build a new one.

what Preaching  
it is that the  
Scripture com-  
mendeth.

As concerning the necessity of *Preaching*, so effectually set forth by the Scriptures, there is utterly a mistake in the meaning of them. That *Preaching*, which the Scripture maketh absolutely necessary to salvation, is the publishing of the Gospel; to those that know it not. The instruction of Christians in their duty is called *Teaching* in the Scripture. I have made evidence of this difference. The Apostles Commission is to *teach* them whom they have baptized, all that the Lord hath commanded them. The Kingdom of God is not in word; but in power. But if we call the teaching of Christians *Preaching*, then it must be such, for matter and for manner both, as may indeed convict Christians of the duty of Christians; and that,  
not

not in the opinion of him that preacheth, but according to the Doctrine of the Church. Whosoever thinketh himself tied to Preach that, which the Church tyeth him not to Preach; not tyed to Preach that which it tyeth him to preach; is in a fair way to edifie the people to ruine, by improving an undue zeal to the dividing of the Church.

In the meantime, the Church preacheth without Sermons by the Psalms, and the Scriptures, and by that Order in which it provideth that they be read; besides all those Forms, in which it prescribeth the Offices of Gods Service to be performed. Which if they contain all that is necessary, generally, and probably to the salvation of all Christians; supposing them duly *Catechized* in those things which the salvation of all, and which their particular estate requires; they that never heard many Sermons, may have heard more and better *Preaching* than hundreds and thousands of Sermons, dangerous, if not destructive to salvation, (a thing which experience proves more than possible) can furnish them, who shall do nothing but run from Sermons to Sermons. I grant it was a just complaint at the Reformation, that the People were not taught their duty. But I do not grant, either that they cannot be taught their duty, without two Sermons every Lords day; or, that they are like to be taught their duty by two Sermons every Lords day. It is not possible to have men for all Churches, fit to preach twice a day to the edifying of the People. It will not be possible to maintain their Preaching such, as may be accounted an Office of Gods service.

In the Ancient Church, for divers hundred years, all that were admitted to stay all this while; that is, till the Sermon were done; were not to be present at the Eucharist, were not to communicate. As *Converts* not baptized, as the *relapsed*, as the possessed by unclean Spirits; in which rank the *Lunatick*, the *Epilepticke*, the *Framick* were accounted. And reason good, for they were not to communicate, at least till death. And yet they were not to be dismissed without the Prayers of the Church; Prayers fitting their several estates, for their proficience, or for their recovery, that they might come to communicate. I will not here undertake, that all which remained did always communicate; though I doubt not, I may undertake that

*There may be Preaching without Sermons, and Sermons without Preaching.*

*The difference between the second Service in the Ancient Church, and our Communion Service.*

that the Rule of the Church required them always to communicate. For when the World was come into the Church, the Rule that prevailed in time of Persecution, there is no marvel that it could not then prevail. By St. *Chrysostom* alone it appears sufficiently, that the Rule was well enough known; but not in force even in his time. So when they that might not communicate were dismissed, they that would not communicate remained nevertheless. For the Eucharist was not to be set aside for their negligence. This is the difference between the *first and second Service*; which is not the same with our *Communion Service*. For the first Service ended when the Prayers of the Church began. Our Communion Service is that which is properly called the Liturgy in Greek: namely, the Office which the Eucharist is to be celebrated with. That which goes before the *Offertory* belongs not properly to the *second Service*, according to the Primitive Form; for the presenting of the Elements was always, every where, the beginning of it.

The General  
Preface, and the  
Prayers of the  
Church at the  
Eucharist.

The Prayers of the Church began with *Thanksgiving* to God, for making Man, and setting him over the Creatures; for taking care of him after his Fall, teaching the Patriarchs, giving the Law, sending the Prophets; and when all this did not the effect required, for sending our Lord Christ. From this *Thanksgiving*, both the Action of the Sacrament, and the consecrated Elements are still called the *Eucharist*. And it is called a *Preface*, in a very Ancient *African Canon*; to wit, to the consecration of the Elements which followed; which as I said before, is nothing else but a Prayer, that God would send the Holy Ghost upon the present Elements, and make them the *Body and Blood* of Christ, that they who should receive them worthily might be filled with his Grace. The common Prayers of the Church, that is, of those who are admitted to Communion with the Church; were always made at the *Altar*, or *Communion-Table*, in the action of the Sacrament. Reason good. How can Christians think their Prayers so effectual with God, as when they are presented at the Commemoration of the Sacrifice of Christ crucified; the *Representation* whereof to God in heaven, makes his *Intercession* there so acceptable? Especially by those who maintain the Covenant of their Christianity, contracted at their Baptism, by communicating in the Eucharist.

Here

Here then, that is, at the celebrating of the Eucharist, *Prayers, Supplications, and Intercessions*, were made for all estates in the Church; and for their respective necessities; for the averting of all Gods Judgments, for the obtaining of all his blessings: for publick Powers and their Ministers; for the Governours and Ministers of the Church, high and low; for publick Peace and Prosperity; for the Seasons and Fruits of the year; for the Sick and Distressed; for the helps of Gods Grace in all parts of that Christianity which we profess, passing by daily offences: for particular occasions of interceding with God, which each particular Congregation may have. And there be good and sufficient witnesses; the Author of the Commentary upon St. Paul to Timothy under St. Ambrose his name; the Author *de Vocazione Gentium*, St. Augustine, and Pope Celestine in his Epistle *ad Gallos*; that this was the practice of the whole Church, and that in obedience to St. Pauls instructions to Timothy, 1 Tim. II. 1—6. And this confirms my opinion; that St. Paul ordering *Prayers, Supplications, Intercessions and Thanksgivings* for Kings, and all in authority; means, that *Prayers, Supplications and Intercessions* be made for Kings, and the rest, at *Thanksgiving*; that is, when the Eucharist is celebrated. For that the word *ευχαριστια*, in the sense of Ancient Christians, signifies the celebrating of the Eucharist, I have produced plentiful evidence. However the Ancient Church manifestly signifieth, that they did offer their *Oblations*, out of which the Eucharist was consecrated, with an intent to *intercede* with God for publick or private necessities; and that out of an opinion, that they would be effectual; alledging the Sacrifice of Christ crucified then present, which renders Christs intercession effectual for us. And this is the true ground, why they attributed so much to this Commemoration of the Sacrifice; which makes nothing for the effect of it in private Masses; but more then will be valued for the frequenting of the Holy Eucharist.

The Consecration ended always with the Lords Prayer. Which confirms my Opinion, that St. Paul, when he saith *How shall the unlearned say Amen to thy Thanksgiving?* 1 Cor. XIV. 16. means that *Amen*, which came after the Lord Prayer; taking *Thanksgiving* there for celebrating the Eucharist. For there is nothing so generally evident in Antiquity, as the begin-

*The Prayer of Oblation instituted by St. Paul, and the matter of it.*

*The Lords Prayer at the Eucharist.*



beginning of the Consecration at *Sussum corda*, or *lift up your hearts*; and the ending of it with the Lords Prayer, and the *Doxology*; which, in my opinion, being so frequented upon this occasion, by the licentiousness of Copyists, in time came to be crowded into the Text of the Scripture. For it is manifest enough, that the most considerable Copies do not own it.

*The Place for  
the Common  
Prayers.*

But the Common Prayers for all estates, as it seems, sometimes went before the Consecration, sometimes came after it. For I am to seek for evidence in the Records of the Latin Church, importing that they came after the Consecration. And yet I have made it evident, that they were used of old by the Latin Church, at celebrating of the Eucharist; though now not found in the present Latin Mass. And the Liturgy of the Church of *Alexandria*, and the *Ethiopick*, depending upon that Church, have them before the Consecration. But the best and most *Greekish* Forms and Authorities agreeing therewith, make them come after it.

C H A P.

## C H A P. XVI.

*Difference in the state of Souls departed in Grace before Judgment. The Ancient Church never prayed to remove them out of Purgatory. To what purpose they were remembered at the Eucharist. The Saints departed pray for the Militant Church. Of Prayers to the Saints departed. No Common Prayer in the Pulpit by Gift, but in a set Form at the Communion-Table. Apostolical Graces subject to Order. Of the Graces of the Spirit in St. Paul, and the Original of Litanies. The Prayers of the Eucharist how prescribed by the Apostles. Prayers of the Reformed Churches in the Pulpit, but by a Form. The effect of the Long Parliament Prayers by the Spirit.*

**O**Ne point of these Prayers I must speak to here in particular; to wit, the Commemoration of the Dead, for which the Mass is now pretended by the Church of Rome, a Sacrifice for quick and dead; to what effect the Scripture, expounded by the practice of the whole Church, may be thought to allow it. I have shewed out of the *Revelation*, that the Souls of *Martyrs*, appearing before the Throne of God, in the Court of the *Tabernacle*; (to wit, in the *Jerusalem* which is above) the Throne appears to *St. John* indeed; but it is to be understood in the *Holy of Holies*; and therefore is not seen in the Court of the

*Difference in the state of Souls departed in Grace, before Judgment.*

Tabernacle. But those 144000 that were sealed, and preserved from the destruction of *Jerusalem*, appear not in the Court of the Tabernacle, but on *Mount Sion*, a place of inferior holiness: And sing not the Martyrs Song, but are only able to *learn* it, which no body else could do. Sufficient Arguments of difference in the state of blessed Souls; though all beneath that which the Resurrection promiseth; which all of them earnestly desire. Suppose the place to be the *third Heavens*; suppose that it is called *Paradise*; (because of necessity it answers the Figure of the *earthly Paradise*;) suppose that in respect of the Saints that died under the Law, it is called *Abrahams bosom*; there may be *inferiour Mansions* in the mean time before the Resurrection for Souls of inferior holiness, though they depart in the state of Grace. For how oft do the Apostles signify a solicitous expectation of the Day of Judgment, in those whom they suppose to die Christians? A thing which can by no means stand with the estate of those that are before the Throne of God, praising him day and night in the Court of the Tabernacle. And therefore St. *Ambrose* and St. *Augustine* had great reason to follow the fourth Book of *Esdrae*, (written, without doubt, by a very ancient Christian, though not authorized by the Church) placing the generality of Souls departed in the state of Grace in certain *secret receptacles*; signifying no more than the unknown condition of their estate. For the practice of the Church in *interceding* for them at the Celebration of the Eucharist, is so general, and so ancient, that it cannot be thought to have come in upon imposture; but that the same aspersions will seem to take hold of the Common Christianity.

The Ancient Church never Prayed to remove them out of Purgatory.

But to what effect this Intercession was made; that is, indeed the due point of difference. For they who think that the Ancient Church prayed, and do themselves pray for the removing of them from a place of *Purgatory* pains, into perfect happiness by the clear sight of God, offend against the Ancient Church, as well as against the Scripture both ways. For *Justin Martyr* makes it a part of the Gnosticks Heresie, that the Soul without the body is in perfect happiness. They indeed held it, because they denied the Resurrection. But the Church therefore believing the Resurrection, believes no perfect

fect happiness of the Soul before it. And the great consent of the Ancient Church in this point, is acknowledged by divers learned Writers in the Church of *Rome*. Neither is the consent of it less evident in this, That there is no translating of Souls into a new estate, before the great Trial of the general Judgment.

In the mean time then, what hinders them to receive *comfort and refreshment, rest, and peace, and light*, (by the visitation of God, by the consolation of his Spirit, by his good Angels) to sustain them in the expectation of their tryal, and the anxieties they are to pass through, during the time of it? And though there be hope for those that are most solicitous to live and die good Christians, that they are in no such suspense, but within the bounds of the heavenly *Jerusalem*; yet, because their Condition is uncertain, and where there is hope of the better, there is fear of the worse; therefore the Church hath always assisted them with the Prayers of the living, both for their speedy tryal, (which all blessed Souls desire) and for their easie absolution, and discharge with glory before God, together with the accomplishment of their happiness in the receiving of their bodies.

*To what purpose they were remembered at the Eucharist.*

Now all Members of the Church Triumphant in Heaven, according to the degree of their favour with God, abound also with love to his Church Militant on earth. And though they know not the necessities of particular persons, without particular Revelation from God; yet they know there are such necessities so long as the Church is Militant on earth. Therefore it is certain, both that they offer continual prayers to God for those necessities, and that their prayers must needs be of great force and effect with God, for the assistance of the Church Militant in this warfare. Which if it be true, the Communion of Saints will necessarily require, that all who remain solicitous of their tryal be assisted by the prayers of the living, for present comfort and future rest. That the living beg of God a part and interest in the benefit of those Prayers, which they who are so near to God in his Kingdom tender him without ceasing for the Church upon earth. As for prayers for the translating of Souls out of Purgatory; the beginning of their coming into the Church is visible.

*The Saints departed pray for the Militant Church.*

*Of Prayers to  
the Saints de-  
parted.*

And so is the coming in of those Prayers, which call upon the Saints departed by name in any publick Office of Devotion in the Church. The voluntary devotions of private persons, most of them ignorant and carnal, are no Argument of the Original and general practice of the Church. And there is no mark of these invocations, till *Processions* were frequented with *Litanies*, which consisted most an end of them; and could not be in use before the time of *Constantine*, but were not in use till a good while after it. The abuse hath increased so far, (especially in addressees to the Blessed Virgin) that the same things are desired of them, and in the same terms in which they are desired of God, even in the holy Scripture. That the appearance of Devotion to the Mother is visibly and outwardly no less than to the Son. So that were there not a profession of that Church extant, contradicting the proper sense of such Prayers, and forcing them that address them, unless they will contradict themselves to abate their own meaning, and to expound them to signifie no more than obtaining that of God, which they are desired to grant of themselves; they could not be excused of Idolatry. But can by no means be excused, for leading simple Christians upon a Precipice of such horrible danger, by encouraging both them, and those that teach them such devotions. For did not carnal Superstition hope for Temporal blessings, from such voluntary applications, without that promise of God, which the condition of our Christianitie engageth; how should a Christian be induced to go about by a Saint, that hath immediate access to God to the same effect?

*No Common  
Prayer in the  
Pulpit by Gift;  
but in a set  
Form, at the  
Communion  
Table.*

That which hath been said of the Primitive Liturgy, barreth the pretence of this time, requiring the Liturgy settled by Law of this Kingdom to be changed, upon a ground never heard of in the Church for 1600 years. That every Minister (whether meaning Bishop, Priest and Deacon, or Priest only) is to have a gift in praying: and that his people ought to pray that which his gift furnisheth, and not that which the Church prescribeth. And to the end that such gifts may be used, that no Minister be tied to celebrate the Eucharist above thrice a year; and that in case he have convenient company. But that they, whose age and infirmity enables them not to preach and pray thus in the Pulpit,  
reading

reading the Service over and above, be not tied to minister the Service prescribed. Now would I have those that demand this to shew me, that ever the Prayers, for which the Church meeteth, were made in the Pulpit for 1500 years after Christ. I know I have alledged a Prayer of St. *Ambrose* before his Sermon; I know there is a passage of St. *Augustine* alledged to the same purpose. But neither of them signifies any more, than a Prayer to God to bless them in their Preaching. The Common Prayers of the Church are another thing, even that which I have said. The Common Prayers of the Church, on all ordinary and solemn Assemblies, were made at the Altar; because the Eucharist was held always, and ought to be held always, the principal Office of Gods Service, for which Christians ought to assemble more frequently, than their can be either ability, or opportunity for Preaching. And that which I have said of the Primitive Liturgy is full evidence hereof. For I have shewed a set Form of it; (which these men return a *non invenimus* of to his Majesties Commission) but that ever there was any Prayer of the People used in the Pulpit, will never appear.

I grant that there were miraculous Graces under the Apostles, which St. *Paul* directs the use of in ministring the Prayers of the Church; but that all Ministers had them, they who require an ordinary Gift in all Ministers, to that purpose, cannot prove. Much less, that this ordinary Gift is to succeed those miraculous graces in all Ministers: For even then, St. *Paul* saith, that the *Spirits of the Prophets were to be subject to the Prophets*; because *God is not the God of confusion, but of order*. And therefore charges all that pretended to such Graces, to acknowledge the Grace of an Apostle in him: and to be subject to the *Orders* which there he gives out. If the immediate inspirations of Gods Spirit were so dispensed, that Inferiours could presume nothing to the prejudice of Order against Superiours, upon that pretence; much more, now that Christianity is settled, and the Unity of the Church a part of it, are the Gifts of Inferiours to be ruled by the gifts of Superiours; that Order, in which Unity consisteth, may be preserved.

St. *Paul* saith, that the *Spirit maketh intercession for the Saints with groans unutterable*. And St. *Chrysostome* saith thereupon, that

*Apostolical  
Graces subject  
to Order.*

*Of the Graces  
of the Spirit in  
St. Paul, and the  
Original of  
Litanies.*



that they who had these *Miraculous Graces*, being employed to minister the Prayers of the Church, did offer them to God with those deep sighs and groans, which could hardly express what the Spirit suggested. But addeth, that the Deacon did the same in his time. And this is visibly true, by all that remains of the Liturgy in the Records of the Church. It is evident, that though the Bishop or Priest, celebrating the Eucharist, did offer the Common Prayers which I have described; yet the Deacon also indited the same to the people, from point to point, as you have it to this day in our English Litanies; the people answering from point to point, *Lord have mercy*, or some such acclamation as our Litanies do direct. So far is the Catholick Church from the Maxim now pretended, that the Priest alone is the mouth of the People in their Prayers. And the sighs and groans of that deep devotion, which *St. Paul* saith the Spirit then moved, and *St. Chrysostom*, that the People answering the Deacon then expressed, the form of our Litanies now containeth and expresseth. And indeed, these Prayers which the Deacon indited, are called Litanies in divers of the ancient Liturgies; shewing that our Litanies are but a Transcript of them for the use of other occasions, besides the Celebration of the Eucharist. And *Smectymnus* may remember how much they mistook *Justin Martyr*, thinking he had said, That the Minister prayed thus *according to his Gift*; who saith indeed, that he prayed *with all his might*, to wit, with all the Devotion he could use. Which devotion, as it is not to be found in their Pulpit-Prayers, pretending to apply the Gift to the present occasion: so it visibly breaths in the Litanies, through all occasions of Gods Church.

*The Prayers of  
the Eucharist  
how prescribed  
by the Apostles.*

When miraculous Graces failed, the Prayers of the Church were not to fail. And the Apostles having delivered that which I have said to the Church, whosoever was authorized to celebrate the Eucharist, both must be, and easily might be instructed how he should discharge that Office. There is so much agreement, both for matter and manner, in that which remains of it in the Records of the Church, as to justify those that affirm it to be received by Tradition from the Apostles. Thus was the Form prescribed from the beginning. In time abuses might come, For what Rule can there be in humane

Roman business, that shall not be subject to doubt? Therefore the *Ancient Canons*, which I speak of, Orders that Bishops should confer the *Form* which they used (no wit, through their *Dioceses*) with their fellow Bishops. Other Canons interceding, that the same *Form* should be used throughout every Province. In time the Church of *Rome* obtained, that the *Form* thereof should be received all over the *West*.

We see in the mean time, what this pretense of Gifts tends to, even to shut the Eucharist out of doors, or to confine it to thrice a year, in case there be company; which case may be so managed, that a man need not be tied to celebrate the Eucharist all his life time. This is the satisfaction the Church hath, for their withholding the Eucharist so many years from those that could not endure the ignorance, malice, and insolence of their *Duckran Priests*. I grant that *Calvins* Reformation brings the Common Prayers from the Altar into the Pulpit; and by that means, confines the Communion to four times a year. But are we to follow *Calvin* in this, wherein the whole Church of God is against *Calvin*? Wherein the Rule of this Church, and the Law of the Kingdom, agrees with the whole Church against *Calvin*? Was it the way to reform the abuse of private Masses, to shut out the Communion excepting four times a year? It must be said, that it was not the Reforming, but the *Deforming* of the Church: And the reforming thereof consists in restoring the Eucharist into the place that it ought to hold among the Offices of the Church: so that the Communion thereof may be most generally and continually frequented, by Christians most prepared. But *Calvin* dreamed of no Gifts all the while. The Form of Common Prayer is as much prescribed, according to *Calvin*, as according to the Church of *England*, though it be read in the Pulpit.

It is the new Gospel of the Long Parliaments, that set up the pretence of *praying by the Spirit*; the Gift whereof is now claimed for every Ministers privilege in bar to Gods Church. Though it be manifest, that the greatest part have no such gift, so to minister the Offices of the Church as may be to the discharge of the people, the honour of God, and of Christianity; yet the Law of the Land must be changed, as supposing that which we see is not. The weakness and Imperfections, the Falt-

Prayers of the  
Reformed  
Churches in the  
Pulpit, but by  
a form.

The effect of the  
Long Parliamen-  
ment Prayers by  
the Spirit.

hoods,

hoods, the Blasphemies, the Slanders, the Sedition, the Schism that we have known vented in such Prayers, oblige us to conclude, that there is no such Gift in all Ministers; at least, not of Gods Spirit. And therefore that we must not forsake Gods Church; changing the Form that is ruled by the Patern thereof, and the Eucharist to boot, for the Arbitrary Prayers that every Ministers Gift shall vent in the Pulpit.

## C H A P. XVII.

*The Lords Day, observed by the Authority of the Church. Therefore other Festivals, and times of Fasting, are to be observed. How Places and Persons become qualified for Gods Service. Preaching not convertible with Ministring the Sacraments. Times, Places, Persons, and Things consecrated to Gods Service, under the Gospel. Ceremonies signifying by Institution necessary in Gods Service. What kind of signification requisite. Not enough for the Presbyterians to allow Ceremonies.*

*The Lords Day  
observed by the  
Authority of the  
Church.*

**T**He determining of Times, and Places, and Persons, by which, and at which, of the Circumstances and Ceremonies, of the Form and Order, according to which the Service of God is to be celebrated, is the Office, and therefore is within the power of the Church. The substance of Christianity, wherein salvation consisteth, was determined by our Lord in person to his Apostles. That which he trusted them with, was the regulating of his Church, supposing the same Christianity, that God might be served by the Assemblies of such,  
as

as might appear to profess it. That which he trusted the Apostles with, the Church remains, of necessity, trusted with by the Apostles; saving the personal Gift of the Holy Ghost in the Apostles, rendering their Acts blameless, in that estate for which they were made; though not sufficient for all estates of the Church. Otherwise, the power of the whole Church is the power of the Apostles: and obligeth the parts of the Church, not to transgress the Acts of it. Because the Unity of the Church is equally concerned in them; and the substance of Christianity in neither of both. This discovereth the superstition of that Imposture which is pretended, by deriving the Obligation of the Lords day from the Jewish Sabbath. For what reason can endure, that the Church should be bound to keep the first day of the week, by that Precept, which tyed the Synagogue to keep the last day of the week? Seeing then the Obligation of it is to be derived from the Act of the Apostles; (that is, from the power of the Church: For being once received by the whole Church, it is for ever received to the same effect; if the premises be true) it is the same Obligation that ties all, to observe the times appointed, for the service of God, by the Church; whether Fasting daies or Festivals. The example of the Primitive Christians at *Jerusalem* justifieth *St. Hierome*, and others of the Fathers, affirming that the Church should, and would serve God continually, in publick, could the business of the world stand with it. And therefore that order is to be accounted most Christian, that provides most opportunity for frequenting the publick service of God.

If this were considered, it would appear a meer Imposture, to demand, that the Lords day be celebrated with Sermons morning and evening, and arbitrary prayers to usher them in and out; treading undeseet all other times, set apart by the whole Church, for the service of God, by such Offices as it enjoyeth. If we weigh by our own Weights, and mete by our own Measures; not only the mysteries of our Lords dispensation in the Flesh, but the memories of his Apostles and Saints; not only the time of *Lent*, and the Wednesdays and Fridays; but the time of *Advent*, the Evens of Festivals, the *Ember* and *Rogation* days, once appointed to that purpose, must still be solemnized, for the Festivals and Fasts of Gods Church. To set

*Therefore other Festivals and times of Fasting are to be observed.*

set a peculiar mark upon the Lords Day, as if the time of it were more obliging, then other time that is appointed to the same purpose, is to change the day, but to retain the Jews Superstition; as *Calvin* most truly hath told them, who in other things commit Idolatry to his Opinion: but wherein he follows the whole Church, (in this point, and in the state of souls before the Resurrection) bid him farewell.

*How places and persons become qualified for Gods Service. Preaching not convertible with ministering the Sacrament.*

The Case is the same in the qualities of places, as well as of persons. For the exercise of Christianity by the Law of this Kingdom, there must be places where all must meet; they must be limited by the authority of the Church; they must not be balked, for other places of mens private choise, but by those that are willing to be charged with Schism for doing it. They that quarrel the Bishops power in all other things, must call this also in question, when they mean to weigh by their own Weights, and mete by their own Measures. They are very studious to confound the difference between Priest and Deacons, by having all called *Ministers*; being a Term that may serve all Orders, *ministering those Offices* which the Church enableth them to minister. But they who would impose this sense upon the stile of *Ministers of Gods Word and Sacraments*; that all and no other but they who are ordained to Preach, are ordained also to Baptize and celebrate the Eucharist; must be told that this is an Imposture, till they shew better reason for it, than hitherto hath been shewed. For I conceive, I have shewed sufficient reason that the power of celebrating the Eucharist is convertible with the power of the Keys, qualifying all Christians for the Eucharist; which in the Bishop onely extendeth to publick causes, concerning his whole Church or Diocess; but in all Presbyters, to private Causes, wherein it may be questionable, between God and the Conscience, whether a Christian be qualified for the Eucharist, or not. As for the Sacrament of Baptism that, as the Bishop only allows it, in any case that may be questionable; so the ministering of it may come to a Deacon, in the Priests absence, nay to a Lay-man, rather then that any Child should die unbaptized. Neither is the Office of preaching restrained, either to Priests or Deacons alone, by any other authority, then that of Gods whole Church; which being once passed in the Case, by the general Custom and Practice of it, it must



must be the greatest Sacrilege in the World; that is, the Sacrilege of Schism; to transgress it.

The respect due to the memories of the Apostles, and other Saints and Martyrs of Christ, is a reason sufficient to determine the time and place for the service of God. To question, that they are not just occasions for the consecrating of Festivals and of Churches, to the service of God, in honour of their memories, is a just presumption, that men seek to be saved by some other Christianity, than that which their Doctrine and their Blood planted. But their names, and the Festivals and the Churches that bear their names, are but circumstances, determining that service to be acceptable to God, which is performed in the Unity of his Church; the authority whereof assigneth them to that purpose. No more are the Utensils and Ornaments of Churches, the Vessels in which the Sacraments are celebrated. But they who think it Superstition that these things should be set apart from Vulgar use, and reserved only for Gods service, plainly commit Idolatry to their own imaginations in it. For it is manifest, that Consecration was in force, not only by the Law of *Moses*, but before it, under the Law of nature, as the Fathers call it; under those precepts which God gave *Noah* after the Flood, as the Jews will have it. And therefore it tended, not only to figure Christ to come, but to maintain the service of God, and that reverence which it ought to be performed with. What colour can there be, that the Consecrations that were in force by the Law were figurative of Christ to come? And the Sacrilege of *Judas*, as well as of *Ananias* and *Sapphira*, remain unquestionable; because the subsistence of the Church, upon Oblations consecrated to that purpose, from the beginning, is as visible as the Church. As for the sense of the Catholick Church from the beginning, he that believes the Unity thereof cannot question it. They therefore that have the Impudence to make that Superstition, which the people of God, both before and since Christ, have always used for the service of God, do they not commit Idolatry to their own Imaginations, which they prefer so far before all the world besides? Indeed the solemnity of Consecration requires a further question, of Ceremonies in the service of God; whether or no they be for the advantage of Gods service; whether or no it be in

*Times, places, persons and things consecrated to Gods Service, under the Gospel.*



the power of the Church, to determine them for that purpose: For the solemnity of Consecrations passes not without Ceremonies.

*Ceremonies signifying by institution necessary in Gods service.*

We have this character of the Presbyterians published for their advantage: That they allow the *natural expressions of Reverence and devotion*, as kneeling and lifting up of the hands and eyes in prayer: as also those meer circumstances of *decency and order*, the omission whereof would make the service of God, either not decent, or less decent; but Ceremonies of *instituted mystical* signification they allow not. But are not the mysteries of Christianity, the Incarnation, Death, Resurrection, and Ascension of Christ, things instituted by God, not determined by nature? Is not the signifying of them, whereby they come to Remembrance, the means to procure and to encrease that Reverence and Devotion, which we are to attend the service of God with, and the inward affection which it expresseth? And why not then Ceremonies, instituted to signify things which Gods Grace, not nature determineth? Shall it be Christianity to believe the Institution of things above nature, for our Salvation by Gods Grace? And shall it be prejudicial to Christianity, to institute the means of procuring that Reverence and Devotion, which the Remembrance of them in the public service of God requireth? Shall the worship of God by Christians be tyed to signify no more, then nature directeth Jews, Mahometans, and Pagans to signify by it? Compare this new Gospel with the perpetual practice of Gods people, whether before or after the Law, whether before or after Christ; and you shall easily see, that it cannot be accounted Superstition, but by those that commit Idolatry to their own Imaginations.

*what kind of signification requirer.*

Let the signification be that which natural reason is able to interpret, in all sorts of Christians; and whether they allow it to be called *Mystical* or not, they must allow it as properly *Religious*; that is as tending to advance that Devotion, which the Religion of a Christian signifieth, in the point of Gods service. And truly I do not, nor doth the Church, to my knowledg, allow the Ceremonies of the Church of *Rome*, the signification whereof is not to be understood, by all sorts of Christians; but require Books of learning to interpret their signi-

significations. They that serve God in a Language unknown to the people, do accordingly, when they serve him with Ceremonies which they cannot understand. Allowing it Reformation to serve God in English, I allow it Reformation to cut off the Superfluity of such Ceremonies; as stealing the nourishment of Devotion from the heart, wherein God hath placed his service. And therefore, I think it reason to submit to this Issue; whether or no, the Ceremonies in question be according to the use of the Primitive Church, which the Reformation pretendeth, or should pretend, to restore. For I find that in the Primitive and Good Times of Christianity, the Church was far enough from seeking such abstruse and far fetched significations. And that is a visible Rule, which the common profession of Reformation determines. But I allow no man to alledge the use of the Primitive Church, grown out of use long before the Reformation, in bar to any Ceremony now settled by Law; not weighing by the same Weights, nor meting by the same Measures, in all other things. It is neither good conscience in them, nor would be in the publick, to change a Law of the Land upon a pretense, which they that alledge will not stand to in another case.

But it is enough for Presbyterians to allow Ceremonies which nature teacheth, to allow order and decency in circumstances? Have they debauched this wretched people to such horrible profaneness, and irreverence, that they can think fit to pray sitting on their seats; to such barbarous confusion, that they can think every mans own fanlie the best order to exercise the Liberty of Christians in Gods service; and now think to satisfie with allowing the contrary? What shall the Church gain by reconciling them, if having contributed so much to the destruction of order, they contribute not more then so to the restoring of it? but that must be the care of Superiors. I will only mention the sign of the Cross; a Ceremony of so much reverence, and so general use in the whole Church of God, from the beginning, that nothing but the difficulty of recalling it, preserving Unity among our selves, can excuse this Church for not restoring it in many other Offices. But to put it out of the Office of Baptism would be to condemn the whole Church of God, without giving satisfaction to them; who having obtained the

Not enough for  
the Presbyterians  
to allow  
Ceremonies.

silencing

silencing of it in Consecrating the Eucharist, according to the Liturgy under *Edward VI.* have thereby been encouraged to demand so much more.

## C H A P. XVIII.

*Offices which the Fathers call Sacraments, for their Ceremonies. Why the Bishop only Confirmeth. The effect of Ordination requireth Ceremony in giving it. Why the Ordinations of our Presbyters are void. The necessity of Penance. The observation of Lent, and the Use of it. The necessity of private Penance, for the cure of secret sin. Of anointing the sick, according to St. James. Marriage of Christians not to be Ruled by Moses Law. Instituted Ceremonies are Sacraments with the Fathers. The Ceremonies of these Offices justifie Instituted Ceremonies.*

*Offices which the Fathers call Sacraments for their Ceremonies.*

**B**Ut for the justifying of Ceremonies, why should I alledge any thing, but those Offices of the Church, which the Fathers have called *Sacraments*, as well as Baptism and the Eucharist? I conceive, I have alledged so sufficient a reason for the difference between those two and the rest, that slander it self cannot undertake to blast my meaning in that point. For things necessary to the Salvation of Christians as Christians are, by that mark, for ever distinguished from things necessary to the Salvation of Christians, as Members of the Church. Because the Salvation of private Christians is concerned, in not understanding the intent of the former sort; but in the latter sort, cannot be

be concerned by not understanding the intent of them ; but by violating that Order and Unity of the Church, which the Regular Use of them serveth to maintain. That which I am to say of them here consists of two points. That they are Offices necessary to be ministred to all Christians, concerned in them ; and that they are to be solemnized with those Ceremonies, for which they are without any cause of offense, called *Sacraments* by the Fathers of the Church.

How necessary is it, that those that are baptized Infants, when they come to discretion, and to receive the Eucharist, should give account of the hope that is in them, and undertake their Christianity upon which it is grounded ? For he hath not this hope to God, he appeareth not to the Church to have it, but upon these terms. And thus far the parties seem content. But why should not Presbyters *Confirm*, as well as Bishops ; that can baptize and celebrate the Eucharist, which is more to the Salvation of Christians ? By Commission from Bishops, that they may do it, is a point very disputable. The practice of the Greek Church in the case is not new ; besides some appearance of the like under St. *Gregory* in the West. But that serves not the turn. They must have the *Catechizing* of them after their mode ; and make the grounds of Salvation what they please, and not what the Church appointeth. So the Answer is easie. For neither is Baptism nor the Eucharist ministred, but by authority from the Bishop ; and to Catechize, besides that Form which the Church allows, is to sow the seed of everlasting dissention in matters of Faith. He that thinks there was reason, why St. *Peter* and St. *John* should come to *Confirm* those whom the Deacon St. *Philip* had baptized, can never want a reason, why the Bishop alone should do it. For he cannot minister the means of Salvation alone. But the Faith and the Unity of his Church with the rest, is not to be preserved without him. Therefore the Gift of the Holy Ghost, which Baptism promisseth, dependeth upon the Bishops blessing ; because it dependeth upon the Unity of the Church. Therefore Hereticks and Schismatics, who by departing from the Unity of the Church, bar themselves of the effect of their Baptism ; being received with the Bishops blessing, in the Primitive Church, were justly thought to recover their Title to it.

*why the Bishop only Confirmeth.*

If

*The effect of Ordination requirerh Ceremony in giving it.*

If Ordination were taken for the conveying of publick Authority, to minister the Offices of Gods Church, by the act of those that have received, by their Ordination, authority to propagate the same; there would be no marvel that St. Paul should suppose a grace received by Timothy, through the *laying one of his hands, or the hands of the Presbytery*. For if the profession of Christianity infer the Grace of Baptism; shall not the profession of that Christianity, which the state of the Clergy in general, or that particular degree to which every man is ordained, importeth, infer the Grace which the discharge of it requireth? What is there to hinder it, but the want of sincerity in the undertaking that, which the Order that a man undertakes, requires him to undertake? This is that which renders those Prayers of the Church of no effect, as to God, whereby the power is effectually conveyed, as to the Church.

*Why the Ordinations of our Presbyters are void.*

In the mean time, shall not those Prayers be solemnized with due Ceremony, by which so great a Power in the Church is conveyed? Now seeing Presbyters never received by their Ordination authority to ordain others; seeing no Word of God gives it them; seeing all the Rules of the Whole Church take it from them; the Attempts of our Presbyters, in Ordaining without and against their Bishops, must needs be void, and to no effect, but that of Schism; in dividing of the Church upon so just a Cause. They could not receive the Power of the Keyes, from them that had nothing to do to give it. And therefore, in celebrating the Eucharist. they do nothing but profane Gods Ordinance. Therefore the lawful Ordaining of them is not re-ordaining; but Ordination indeed, instead of that which was only so called.

*The necessity of Penance.*

If a Christian, after Baptism, fall into any grievous sin, voiding the effect of Baptism, can it fall within the sense of a Christian to imagine; that he can be restored by a Lord have mercy upon me? No it must cost him hot tears, and sight, and grans, and extraordinary prayers, with Fasting and almes, to take revenge upon himself, to appease Gods Wrath, and to mortifie his Concupiscence; if he mean not to leave an entrance for the same sin again: if his sin be notorious, so much the more; because he must then satisfy the Church, that he doth what is requisite to satisfy God, that is, to appease his wrath,

wrath, and to recover his Grace. The Church may be many ways hindred, to take account of notorious sin. But the power of the Keys, which God hath trusted it with, is exercised only in keeping such sinners from the Communion, till the Church be so satisfied.

And for this Exercise, the time of *Lent* hath always been deputed by the Church. The Fast before the Feast of the Resurrection stands by the same Law, by which that stands; for the Feast was from the beginning, the end of the Fast. So the *Lent* Fast, and the keeping of the Lords day, stand both upon the same authority. For the Lords day is but the Remembrance of the Resurrection once a week. It doth not appear that the Fast was kept forty daies, from the beginning. That it was kept before *Easter*, whensoever *Easter* was kept; that is, from the time of the Apostles; it doth appear. The baptizing of *Converses*, the restoring of the *Relapsed*, and the preparing of all, by extraordinary Devotion, to solemnize the Resurrection, was the work of it. Did this Church desire the restoring of this Order, and yet disown *Lent*? *Daniel* abstained from *pleasant meats* when he fasted: the Jews forbid all that comes of the Vine, on the day of Attonement: The Whole Church of God always forbear Flesh and Wine when they fasted. And shall our Licentiousness make the difference of meats superstitious? Then let the late Parliament Fasts be Reformation, that provided a good break-fast to fast with, and heard a Sermon as well after Dinner as before.

If Sin be not notorious, there is no cause why it should not be pardoned without help from the Church; supposing that the sinner exact of himself that Penance, which the Church would or ought to impose. But whether all sinners can be brought to know what that is; or knowing, to impose it upon themselves; let the common reason of Christians judge. They that assure them of Pardon, and the favour of God without it; whether it be themselves, or their false teachers; plainly they murder their souls. The Church of *Rome*, in making the Keys of the Church, the necessary means for pardon of all sin that voids the Grace of Baptism, goes beyond the bounds of truth: In procuring a Law, that all submit to it once a year, goes not beyond the bounds of Justice. It were to be wished, that the

R

abuses

*The observation of Lent, and the use of it.*

*The necessity of private Penance for the cure of secret sins.*



abuses of that Law might be cured, without taking it away. For if it be the power of the Keys that makes the Church the Church; it will be hard to shew the face of a Church, where the blessing of the Church, and the Communion of the Eucharist is granted, and yet no power of the Keys at all exercised? Nay it will appear a lamentable case, to consider, how simple innocent Christians are led on till death, in an opinion, that they want nothing requisite for the obtaining and assuring of the pardon of their sins; when it is manifest, that they want the Keys of the Church, as it is manifest, that the Keys of the Church are not in use for that purpose.

*Of anointing  
the sick accord-  
ing to S. James*

St. James ordaineth, that the Presbyters of every Church pray for the sick, with a promise of pardon for their sins. This supposeth them qualified, by submitting their sins to the Keys of the Church, which the Presbyters do manage. The promise belongs not to the Office of Presbyters upon other terms. He requirerh them also *to anoint the sick with Oyl*, promising Recovery upon it. Not to all that should be anointed. For Christians then should not dye, if true Christians. But as the Disciples of our Lord had used it; no evidence their Commission to the World: So was the manifestation of Gods Spirit, residing in the Church, granted for the benefit of his Church. Neither is there any cause, why the same benefit should not be expected; but the decay of Christianity in the Church. In the meantime, the forgiveness of sin, according to St. James, comes by the Keys of the Church; recovery of health, from the prayers of it. So the Unction of the sick is to recover health, not to prepare for death; as the Church of Rome now useth it; but supposing the health of the Soul restored by the Keys of the Church.

*Marriage of  
Christians not  
to be ruled by  
Moses Law.*

All the pretenses for Divorce of Lawful marriages, all the incestuous Contracts, all the unchristian solemnizing of Christian Wedlock, which the blessed Reformation hath authorized, are to be attributed to one mistake; that the Marriage of Christians stands by the Law of Moses, not by the Gospel of Christ. Our Presbyterians, in their *Confession of Faith*, duly prohibit Marriage in those degrees of alliance, which are prohibited in blood. But out of *Leuiticus*, if they will prove it, their word must serve for our warrant, that this is the sense. If man and Wife be

be one flesh, then is a man as near his Wifes Kin as his own. But man and Wife are not one flesh by *Moses Law*; licensing plurality of Wives, and divorce; though by the Law of Paradise. It was dispensed with after the Flood, and not revived but by our Lord. That Divorce, and plurality of Wives, was not restrained, but by the Gospel; it is impudence to Dispute much more to deny. The Marriage of the Niece, with the Uncle of the half blood, hath puzzled all them that would make it unlawful by *Moses Law*. The Marriage of a Christian with two Sisters successive, will be as hard to condemn by the same. Granting the premises, all these Disputes cease. Marriage is the Bond of one with one, not to be dissolved till death; by the Law of Christ, not by the Law of *Moses*. Whether Adultery dissolve the Bond or not, I leave it disputable for the present, as I find it. Marriage with a Pagan was void by *Moses Law*. St. Paul enables Christians to hold to it. Therefore he refers them not to the Law. Christianity improves *Moses Law* in all things. Therefore Christians cannot be regulated by *Moses Law* in Matrimonial causes. Therefore in the prohibiting of degrees as well as divorce. For *Moses Law* prohibits more then that Law, which the Children of *Noah* received after the Flood, had done. It were better to restrain all that which the present Canon Law restrains then that the incests of the late licentious times should be tolerated. For the present Canon Law restrains not much more, then the Greek Church restrains. But if the Authority thereof be not binding, by reason of the Usurpations of the Church of *Rome*; yet to depart from the Canons of the Whole Church, and of those times which we acknowledge, would be a departure from the whole Church,

He that would bar the Cross, in Baptism, for fear it should be taken for a Sacrament; what would he say to St. *Ambrose*, that calls it down right a Sacrament? I know not what he would say, I know what he should do; he should understand St. *Ambrose* by St. *Ambrose*, when he makes a Kiss to be a Sacrament; as a Religious sign of that Religious affection, which Kinsfolk professed to their near Kinsfolk; whom, in his time, they saluted with a kiss, to signify that, as St. *Ambrose* declar-eth. At this rate St. Pauls holy kiss must needs be a Sacrament. For it was a Religious sign of that charity, which

*Instituted Ceremonies are Sacraments with the Fathers.*

The Ceremonies of these Offices justify instituted Ceremonies.

Christians professed to Christians, when they were to receive the Communion with them. At this rate, it is no marvel that there are found seven Sacraments in the Fathers; For there are more then seven to be found, if there be as many Sacraments as Ceremonies instituted by the Church.

If this be true; the discharging of instituted Ceremonies will be a Defection from Gods Church. If *Confirmation*, *Ordination*, and *Penance*, be Offices, in which the Church is indebted to God, and to his Church; if the effect of them be of such consequence, that they have been always solemnized with the *Imposition of hands*; that Ceremony shall be enough to make them Sacraments at this rate; and yet no neerer to Baptism, and to the Eucharist, than that reason of the difference which I have settled will allow. Nay let the prayers of the Church, for the recovery of the sick, who submit to the Keys of the Church, be solemnized with anointing; (a thing fit enough to be done, may but the ground upon which, and the intent to which it is done, appear) and that shall be a Sacrament; and yet the want of it no more prejudice to salvation, then the disusing of the *Kiss of peace*, which comes (without peradventure) from the Apostles. As for marriage, the solemnity of the blessing, the Ring, the Sacrament of the Eucharist; which, according to the custom of the whole Church, it ought to be ministred with, will easily make it a Sacrament; though Imposition of hands, which is said still to be used in some Eastern Churches, be not used at all in the West. So the effect and consequence of these Offices will oblige the Church always to keep them in use; though the Church of *Rome* makes them Sacraments. But that sense, in which the antient Church makes them Sacraments, serves only to justify the power of instituting Ceremonies in the Church.

## CHAP. XIX.

*The worship of the Host, in the Papacy, is not Idolatry. Christianity would sanctifie kneeling at the Eucharist, though it were. What Images the second commandment forbiddeth. Reverencing of Images in Churches is not Idolatry. Of honouring Images, and of having them in Churches. Mutual forbearance; which St. Paul enjoyneth the Romans, not enjoined elsewhere. Tender Consciences are to submit to superious.*

**T**HEY who give the honour proper to God to his creature are Idolaters. They that worship the Host give the honour due to God to his creature. This is taken for a Demonstration, that the worship of the Host is Idolatry. But will any Papist acknowledge that he honours the Elements of the Eucharist, or as he thinks the Accidents of them, for God? Will common reason charge him to honour that, which he believeth not to be there? A Pagan that honours the Sun for God, believes him to be God. And therefore another Pagan may as well believe another creature to be God. Both Idolaters, for thinking the Godhead to be in one or more creatures. But those greater Idolaters, who thought that the Godhead, to which they took men, (whether living or dead) or other creatures, to be advanced; was inclosed in their images consecrated to the worship of them. He that worships the Host believes our Lord Christ to be the only true God, hypostatically united to our flesh and blood. Which being present in the Eucharist, in such a manner, as it is not present every where; there

*The worship of the Host, in the Papacy, is not Idolatry.*

there is due occasion to give it that Worship in the Eucharist, which the Godhead, in our manhood, is to be worshipped with upon all due occasions. Thus we say he was worshipped in the Antient Church, that believed the Elements to be present. And they were no Idolaters. They that worship the Host do not believe that they remain. Nay they say, they must be flat Idolaters, if they be there. Zeal to their opinion makes them say more than they should say. But if they were there, they would not take them for God: And therefore they would not honour them for God: And that is it, (not saying that they should be Idolaters if the Elements did remain) that must make them Idolaters.

*Christianity  
would sanctifie  
kneeling at the  
Eucharist,  
though it were.*

They that believe not Transubstantiation have cause to forbear the Ceremony. But forbear kneeling at receiving the Eucharist, in an Age that is taught already to sit at their prayers; and who will warrant, that all the prayers of the Church shall not come, in a short time, to hearing the Minister exercise his Gifts, and censuring him for it? Were worshipping the Host Idolatry; Christianity using the gesture of kneeling, to signifie the worship of Christ, were enough to sanctifie it to Gods service. And this they must grant who serve God in Churches, which the Mass hath been used in; taking the Mass for Idolatry, as they do. In fine, Jews and Mahumetans are bound to take the worship of the Host for Idolatry. For they will needs take the Worship of the Holy Trinity for no less. But they who know, that the Godhead of Christ is the reason, for which his flesh and blood is worshipped in the Eucharist, cannot take that Worship for Idolatry, because his flesh and blood is not present in the Eucharist as they who worship it there think it is. For they know that the flesh and blood of Christ is no Idol to Christians, wheresoever it is worshipped.

*What Images  
the second Com-  
mandement for-  
biddeth.*

Whether or no, having Images in Churches be a breach of the second Commandement, can be no more question, then whether or no, to have any Images be a breach of it. For it must forbid Images in Churches, because it forbids all Images. If it be interpreted to forbid only Idols; that is, Images of false Gods; it must be proved, that all Images in Churches are Idols, before it be proved, that they are forbidden by it. It is far more reasonable to say; that the Cherubims, the Brazen Serpent,

Serpent, the Bulls, and other Images in *Solomons* Temple, were no breaches of it; then to say that God did dispence with his own Precept in those cases; having no appearance of any Dispensation in the Scripture, in which the Precept, and the seeming breach are both recorded. But it is manifest, that the Jews allow some kind of Imagery; and I doubt not, but the Mahumetans do the like. And it is manifest, that the publick authority of that Nation, or Religion, could never dispence in that which Gods Law had prohibited. But it is manifest on the contrary, that it did and might restrain that, which Gods Law had licensed; to set an hedge about the Law, and keep the people further from breaking it. Now their restrains tye not Christians, but Jews. And therefore it is manifest, that the Church is tyed no further, then there can appear danger of Idolatry; which if it be so heightned, beyond appearance, as to involve the Church in the crime of it, chargeth the Schism that may come by that means, upon those that so inhanse it.

Now granting that *Epiphanius* and the Council of *Elvira* did hold all Images in Churches dangerous for Idolatry; (of which their is appearance;) it is manifest, that they were afterwards admitted all over. And there might be jealousy of offense, in having Images in Churches, before Idolatry was quite rooted out; of which afterwards there might be no appearance. But no manner of appearance, that Images in History should occasion Idolatry to those Images, in them that hold them the Images of Gods creatures; such as are those Images which represent Histories of the Saints, out of the Scriptures, or other relations of unquestionable credit. The second Council of *Nicaea* seems to have brought in, or authorized addressees to solitary Images of Saints, placed upon pillars to that purpose; whereof there is much mention in the Records of it. But to the Images of Saints, there can be no Idolatry, so long as men take them for Saints; that is, Gods creatures. Much less to the Images of our Lord. For it is the honour of our Lord, and not of his Image. Whereas they who thought their false Gods to dwell in their Images, (which though made them Idols) must needs honour them with the honour proper to God; though in so doing, they honoured indeed the Devil; that brought in Idols. Nay the Council it self, though it acknowledged,

*Reverencing  
of Images in  
Churches is not  
Idolatry.*



knowledge, that the Image it self is honoured, by the honour given to that which it signifieth, before the Image; yet it distinguisheth this honour from the honour of our Lord. And therefore teacheth not Idolatry, by teaching to honour Images; though it acknowledged, that the Image it self is honoured, when it need not.

*Of honouring  
Images and of  
having them in  
Churches.*

For indeed and in truth, it is not the *Image*, but the *Principal*, that is honoured, by the honour that is said to be done to the Image, because it is done before the Image. The Furniture and Utensils of the Church were honoured, in the Spotless times of the Church, as consecrated to Gods service; though the honour of them, being incapable of honour for themselves, was manifestly, and without any scruple, the honour of God. But Images, so long as they were used to no further intent, then the Ornament of Churches, the remembrance of holy Histories, and the raising of devotion thereby; (as at the first, they were used by the Church) came in the number of things consecrated to Gods service. And that Council was never of force in the West, till the usurped power of the Pope brought it in by force. Nor did the Western Church, when it refused the Council, discharge the having of Images in Churches, upon those reasons, and to those purposes which I have declared. So far they remain still justifiable. For he that sees the Whole Church on the one side, and only *Calvin* on the other side, hath he not cause to fear, that they who make them Idolaters without cause, will themselves appear Schismatics in the sight of God for it? For what are they else, who please themselves in a strange kind of *negative superstition*, that they cannot serve God, if they serve him with visible signes of reverence? Who hate the Images, because they hate the Saints themselves, and their Christianity? And therefore, that it be not thought, that we are tyed to those terms of distance, which ignorant Preachers drive their Factions with; it is necessary to declare the grounds of truth, though it displease.

*Mutual forbearance which  
S. Paul enjoyeth the  
Romans, not en-  
joyed else-  
where.*

St. *Paul* writing to the Romans, that were partly Jews, partly Gentiles, converted to Christianity, (as appears by the whole Epistle) forbids them to condemn or despise one another, for making conscience of things (*meats, and times* he expresseth) forbidden by the Law; or for using them without difference.

ence. Hence it is now argued, That nothing can be imposed upon any Christian, which out of tenderness of Conscience, he may think it against Gods Law for him to do. The Answer is, by denying the consequence. And the reason, because it is a particular order of *St. Paul* to that Church, for the present estate of it at that time; and therefore it doth not follow, that the Church can make no Law. For it could make no Law, if it were enough to discharge any man, that it is against his conscience to obey. The evidence for this reason is this; because it appears, that the Apostles did order otherwise in the same cause, when the case was not the same. For it is manifest, that the Apostles and Elders at *Jerusalem* had made an Act in Council, commanding the Gentiles that were converted to Christianity, to abstain from Fornication, and things offered in sacrifice to Idols, from things strangled, and from blood: In fine, from those things from which strangers, that were licensed by the Law to live in the Land of Promise, were bound to abstain. And might not those converted Gentiles have scrupled, whether or no it were lawful for them to be so far Jews, had not the Authority of the Apostles been sufficient to put an end to their scruples? But it is manifest likewise, that when *St. Paul* differed with *St. Peter* at *Antiochia*, about the necessity of compliance with the Jews, for Gentiles turned Christians; he did forbid, and must needs forbid his followers to shew this compliance; lest by that means he might hold them in an opinion of the necessity of the Law, for the salvation of Christians. Here were contrary Provisions, with force of Law, in that very case wherein *St. Paul* commands only mutual forbearance at *Rome*, in that estate wherein he writ his Epistle. And if *St. Paul* were in the right, which they who take his Writings for Scripture do not doubt, then were *St. Peters* followers bound to obey him, notwithstanding any tenderness in their consciences. And he commands, *Tir. l. 10.* — 15. to stop the mouths of those Deceivers of the Circumcision, that would not have all things pure to the pure, because their own consciences were defiled; notwithstanding that they must needs have followers, that were touched in conscience to think those things unlawful, which the Law allowed not. And their Teachers mouths being stopped, were the hearers at their choice, whether they would follow them or not?

S

Where-

*Tender Consci-  
ences are to sub-  
mit to Superi-  
ours.*

Whereby it appears, that Inferiours are to follow the Judgment of Superiours, in matters subject to the power of Superiours, notwithstanding the scruples of their own consciences to the contrary. And that the reason, why the *Romans* are forbidden to condemn, commanded to forbear one another is, because *St. Paul* thought it not meet to order any thing else in the business, during that estate; seeing that he ordereth otherwise in it, for other estates. So that all that remains is, whether the matter in question be within the power of Superiours or not. In which there can be no doubt amongst us, the matters in question being acknowledged indifferent in themselves; and therefore capable to signify that, which Christianity not only alloweth, but requireth. And certainly there is no Law, whether Ecclesiastical or Civil, that error may not scruple at, as inconsistent with a good conscience. Why should not I believe, that a Quaker is really touched in conscience, that he ought not to pay his Tithes, though in obedience to the Law of the Land; as well as a Presbyterian, that he ought not to receive the Communion kneeling? For I see many of the Church of *Rome* suffer, for denying the Right of a Prince excommunicate by the Pope, though it be matter of Civil Law. Therefore if he that grasps too much, is in the way to gripe nothing; then an exception that lies against all Law, will do no effect against a few Ceremonies of this Church.

C H A P.

## C H A P. XX.

*The Declaration of 5 Eliz. enableth Recusants to take the Oath of Supremacy. What further ambiguity that Oath involveth. What scandal the taking of it in the true sense ministreth. That this Oath ought to be enlarged to all pretenses in Religion, that abridge Allegiance. The extent of Secular Power in Reforming the Church.*

**T**He Usurpation of Temporal power by the Pope, upon the pretence of the preheminance of his Church in Ecclesiastical matters, hath given this Crown just occasion to declare it self *Supream Head, or Supream Governour*, (for the kingdom of Heaven is not in word, but in power; as St. Paul saith) in all Causes, and over all Persons, as well Ecclesiastical as Civil. But the capacity of several senses, in words that signifie humane matters, (capable of so great a latitude by their nature) seemeth to have produced out of this Act a Sect of *Erassians*, very dangerous to Christianity; as immediately denying any Ordinance of God for the Visible Unity of his Church, which is an Article of our Creed; but by consequence, shewing all, how they may enjoy the benefit of Civil Law in a state that professes Christianity, without believing any more of Christianity than they please. This capacity was restrained in the beginning of Queen *Elizabeths* Reign, by her Injunctions, by the Articles of Religion, by an Act of Parliament; not to signifie the abolishing, or the disclaiming of Ecclesiastical power, in part or in whole. And to such effect, that it is acknowledged now, in Books written on purpose by one party of Recusants, that they may freely take the Oath of Supremacy; saving the scruple

*The Declaration of 5 Eliz. enableth Recusants to take the Oath of Supremacy.*

that may remain of offending those Recusants, who think that they may not take it. And I can by no means marvel at it: For they who do openly profess that unlimited obedience to the Pope in Ecclesiastical matters, which he requireth; how can they, swearing the Oath of Supremacy, be thought to abjure his Ecclesiastical power in *England*; the words of the Oath being restrained by Law, to disclaim only the Temporal effect of it?

*What further  
ambiguity that  
Oath involveth.*

But it is manifest, that not only the unlimited power of the Pope, but all Authority of a General Council of the Western Churches, (whereof the Pope is and ought to be the chief Member, according to the premises) may justly seem to be disclaimed, by other words of the same Oath. And that, whereas the Pope usurped not only upon the Crown, but upon the Clergy of this Kingdom; all those Usurpations are, by the Act of Resumption under *Henry* the VIII. invested in the Crown. So that when the Oath declares, to maintain all Rights and Preheminences annexed to the Crown; you may understand that maintenance, which a Subject owes his Sovereign, against those that pretend to force his claims from. But you may also understand that maintenance which a Divine owes the Truth, in asserting the Title of the Crown to all Rights vested in it. Which he that believes, that some Rights of the Church are invested in the Crown, ought not to undertake; though as a Subject, for preserving the state of his King and Country, he be tyed to maintain all the claims of the Crown against all the Enemies of it.

*What scandal  
the taking of it  
in the true sense  
minis'tretb.*

Now, if an Oath required by the Sovereign Power bear two senses in the proper signification of the Words; (which is more ordinary than it is believed;) the Subject may undergo in that sense, which truth and right warranteth. And so in regard the Pope, not content with his Regular Authority in the Church, pretends Temporal power in disposing of the Dominions, which he disclaims Communion with, besides absolute Power in matters of Religion; it is lawful to swear, that he ought to have no manner of Power in this Kingdom, as things stand, till he depart from claims so unjust. But there is appearance, that the misunderstanding of it hath produced an Opinion destructive to one Article of the Creed; to the being of any Visible Church, as founded by God. And besides, it is

no;

not possible, that all they, who are called to this Oath by Law, can ever be able to distinguish that sense wherein they ought, from that wherein they ought not to take it. And therefore of necessity the Law gives great offence, and that offence is the sin of the Kingdom, and calls for Gods vengeance upon it. Which though all are involved in, yet in the other World the account will lye upon them that may change it, and do not.

Now it is manifest, that all Recusants believe not the Popes Temporal Power, nor think themselves bound to execute such Acts, as the Bull of *Pius quintus* against Queen *Elizabeth*. Those that do not, how should they be liable to capital punishment, which the Law, in some cases, inflicts? For how should they be taken for the Enemies of their Country otherwise? On the contrary, I have shewed, by the Troubles of *Frankford*, in the beginning of the Reformation, that there was then the same difference of opinion amongst them that held with the Reformation about obedience to Sovereigns, obeying the Church of *Rome*. And that the same difference of opinion was the cause of the late Troubles, appeareth by the aspersion of Popery, upon his late Majesty, alledged to justify the War against him. Whereby it appeareth, that they of that opinion do undergo the Oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance, as provided only against the See of *Rome*, and the claims of it; thinking themselves enabled, notwithstanding the same, to limit their Allegiance, to that which their Religion shall allow. And therefore there is great reason, why the Kingdom should enact a new Oath, extending the Original Allegiance of all Subjects to all cases, in which experience hath shewed, or reason may foresee, that Religion may be pretended to abridge the Obligation of Allegiance. This I am encouraged here to declare, by the late Act of the Kingdom of *Scotland*, establishing for the future the form of an Oath, whereby the obligation of Allegiance is extended to the renouncing, not only of any claim for the See of *Rome*; but of all pretences whatsoever, (whether upon the account of Religion, or of civil Right) of abridging the obligation of it. For though I neither maintain nor find fault with the terms which it useth; yet the agreement and the difference between the case of both Kingdoms, as it evidenceth to all the necessity, so it determineth to them that are to understand the state.

*That this Oath ought to be enlarged to all pretences in Religion, that abridge Allegiance.*



State of both, the agreement and the difference of that which ought to be provided. And seeing it is the true consequence of the common Christianity, that enables the Kingdom to do this; because supposing, as it doth, the State of this World, it cannot extend to the altering of it; there is great reason, why a Divine should be allowed to say it, not entring upon other considerations wherein Religion is not concerned. For in the next place to the bringing in of a new Provision, the conscience of the Kingdom is best discharged, the Scandals that may be occasioned removed, the wrath of God prevented or appeased by the Secular Powers allowing these Interpretations to pass without contradiction, that may enable all estates to depose it with *Judgment*, as well as with *Truth and Righteousness*. We have this evidence for that which I say, That the Authorities of those Divines of this Church, that have declared the sense of the Oath of Supremacy with publick allowance, are now alledged by the Papists themselves, to infer, that the matter of it is lawful, as capable of the sense which they declare.

*The extent of  
Secular Power  
in Reforming  
the Church.*

Now the bounds of Reformation being visible, by the Faith and the Laws of the Catholick Church; the extent of Secular power in Ecclesiastical matters, and over Ecclesiastical persons; (and therefore in the reforming of them) preserving Ecclesiastical Power in persons that have it, by the founding of the Church from God, cannot remain invisible. For in the first place there can be no question, That the Sovereign as a Sovereign, is to maintain his own Rights by such means as he finds meet, against all Usurpations under pretence of the Church, and the Authority of it. For the common Christianity assureth him, that all such Usurpations are contrary to it. And besides, as a Christian Sovereign, it is his Inheritance to be a Member of the Church, and a Protector of all his Subjects in the same right. Therefore all Christian Sovereigns are born Advocates and Patrons of the Faith, and of the Rights of the Whole Church. And if, by lapse of time, they be gone to decay; if by an express Act they have been infringed, it lies in them to restore their Subjects and themselves to those Rights; being brought into evidence by the Authority and credit of the Whole Church. But seeing the determining of the matter of Ecclesiastical Law, as well as of Controversies of Faith,

Faith, belongs to those that have authority in the Church, by the foundation of it; of necessity, the fitting of the present Laws of every Church to those, which the Whole Church hath been ruled by from the beginning; as the difference, which may appear in the state of those bodies to which they were given, shall require; will, by virtue of Gods Law, belong to those that have such Authority, by the Foundation of the Church. And upon these terms the right of Secular Power in Church matters is *accumulative*, and not destructive to the Rights of the Church. And upon these terms only the Sovereign is justifiable at the great Day of Judgment, in things that may be done amiss in Reforming the Church.

CHAP.

## C H A P. XXI.

*The pretense of Infallibility makes the Breach unreconcilable. So doth the pretense of Perspicuity in the Scripture. The Trial must suppose the Catholick Church. The Fanaticks further from the truth of Christianity, than the Church of Rome. The consequence of their Principle worse than that of Infallibility. The point of Truth in the middle between both. How Salvation is concerned in the matter of Free Will and Grace. Salvation concerned in the Sacraments upon the same terms. The abuses of the Church of Rome in the five Sacraments. The Grace of Ordination. The Reformation pretended, no less abuse on the other side. The point of Reformation in the Mean between both. The Superstitions of the Church of Rome. The Superstitions of the Puritans. Why the Pope cannot be Antichrist. How it is just to Reform without the See of Rome.*

*The pretense of  
Infallibility  
makes the Breach  
unreconcilable.*

**A**ND upon supposition of the Premisses, for which I conceive I have produced competent evidence; I proceed to take the Balance in hand, and to put the Extreame into the Scales, that I may put it to the conscience of all, that are resolved

resolved to prefer truth before Faction or prejudice, where the point of Reformation lies upon terms of right : And how near the publick Powers of this Kingdom are bound to come to it, in this Case ; when an Uniformity in Religion is to be settled by Law, for the Church of *England*. In the first place then, the Infallibility of the present Church is to be held for an Error of pernicious consequence, in the Church of *Rome*. For it submits all the parts of Christianity, to the passion and interest of persons, that shall be for the present, in power to sway those matters ; wherein the whole Church is concerned. It is a thing manifest in the World, that though that which concerns all, in point of Religion, is to be treated by all ; yet that which is treated by all, is concluded always by the authority of a few. So things passed, when Councils were frequented. The Freedom of Councils being interrupted, and the present Church accepted for Infallible ; the See of *Rome* will of necessity be the present Church : And the passions and interest thereof will have as much power, in matters of Religion, as those passions and interests can allow, and stand with. What the effect thereof may be, I need not argue to those that profess the Reformation, upon that account. Only thus far they may seem excusable that there is no Act, with force of Law, tying all of that profession to maintain it. Infallibility may be claimed for the whole Church ; and that is true. And it may be claimed for the present Church, which is false. They that pretend to reduce us to the Church of *Rome* would spoil their own market, if they should distinguish thus. Therefore they plead Infallibility, without distinguishing,

On the other side, there is as much difference between the sufficiency of the Scripture, for the salvation of all, and the clear evidence of all that is necessary to be known, for the salvation of all, to all, in the Scriptures. The one is as true, and the other as false, as the Infallibility of the present Church is false, and the Infallibility of the whole Church is true. And to appeal to the Scriptures alone, when the sense of them only is questionable, is to declare, that we will submit to no other trial but our own sense : As they who declare the present Church infallible, can never depart from any thing which once it hath declared.

*So doth the present sense of perspicuity in the Scripture.*

T

For

The Trial must  
suppose the Ca-  
tholick Church.

For it is manifest, that they who appeal to the Scriptures alone, having before this appeal declared themselves in the points of difference between the Reformation and the Church of Rome; do declare themselves tyed in conscience, to stand to that sense of the Scripture, upon which they grounded their opinion, in the matters of difference. What means then can remain to bring that to a Trial, which causes division upon these terms, but to acknowledge one Catholick Church, which our Creed professeth? and by consequence, to submit our *sense of all Scripture*, that remains in question, *all difference in Doctrine, all Laws of the Church*, to be determined according to the sense and practice of the whole Church; that is, within the bounds of it? For to proceed to divide the Church still into more and more parties, and Communions; till we have lost the sense of any obligation, to hold communion with the whole Church; is more destructive to the substance of Christianity, then all that corruption, which the Reformation pretendeth to cure. But confining our sense of the Scripture, our opinions in matter of Doctrine, and the Laws which we demand, within that which the Faith and the Laws of the whole Church may appear to require; we are half the way onward to the point of Reformation, having the ground and reason, and therefore the measure and the terms of it.

The Fanaticke  
jurther from  
the truth of  
Christianity  
then the Church  
of Rome.

The mistake of the Schools, and of the Council of Trent after the Schools, in the nature of *Justification*, and the effect of infused righteousness, to which they ascribe it, is no way destructive to Christianity. No more is the opinion of *satisfaction* and *merit*, in the good works of Christians, so long as it is grounded upon Gods promise; which they that inflame that opinion to the highest, in the Church of Rome, must acknowledge to come into consideration, whether they will or not. As for the merit of Grace, by the works which a natural man is able to do, commonly called *meritum congrui*, as that which is fit for God to give, though not for the worth of the works; it is indeed an Error of greater danger; but never was general in the School, and now generally disallowed; so far it was always from being enjoyed by the Church. But what is this in comparison of that furious Doctrine, that the assurance of a mans Predestination is justifying Faith? In which the opinion of absolute

folute Predestination to Glory, and of Gods predetermining a man to do all that he doth, is twisted together with an Enthusiasme; that we are justified, and made the Children of God, by being assured hereof by his Spirit: Not supposing any condition of Christianity, in consideration of which it is had; and by the knowledg whereof it is assured us. For they that believe, that Gods predetermination is the reason and the ground of freedom in mans Will, and of contingency in the effects of it, supposing freedom and contingency, do thereby bar the ill consequence of their own mistake. But he that can think himself assured of that which the Gospel promiseth, not being assured that he performeth the Christianity, which by his Baptisme he undertaketh; why should he hold himself tied, why should he study and endeavour himself to perform it?

Nay, holding his Christianity, and the Scriptures which teach it, by the same dictate of the Spirit, which assures his salvation upon those terms; why should he not hold that which Christianity and the Scriptures teach not, with the same devotion and assurance, which he accepteth the Scriptures and his Christianity with? Why should he not, with the Gnosticks, and Mahomet, and the Manichees, place his salvation in that which the Spirit teacheth him beside and above the Scriptures; allowing Christianity for proficients? The same consequence takes hold, in some measure, of those who believe the Infalibility of the present Church. For making the sentence thereof the only reason of believing, they tie themselves to accept whatsoever it shall decree, for matter of Faith; and therefore concerning their salvation as much, as it concerns their salvation to believe the Holy Trinity. Indeed there is not so much danger for them. For the persons on whom they repose themselves for the Church, being persons of that interest in the World, which cannot stand with the open corrupting of Christianity; the fear is, that they may authorize those corruptions, which the coming of the World into the Church shall make popular; Not that they shall think it for their interest, to change that, which it is not popular to change.

In the mean time, having shewed the point of Reformation, by shewing the point of truth; whereby all that the Reformation disputes with the Church of Rome is cleared; namely,

*The consequence of their principle worse than that of Infalibility.*

*The point of Truth in the middle between both.*



that that Faith which moveth to undertake Baptism is the Faith which alone justifieth; I have shewed withal, that the express profession hereof is that which must clear us from all imputation of the Schism with the Church of Rome; and of compliance with any Fanaticks, that have taught the opposite Heresie; being by such profession excluded from all liberty of teaching it for the future. They who take justifying faith to be Confidence in God through our Lord Christ, do commit the mistake which I have shewed. And if they go farther, to think that by being assured of Gods Grace, they can never die out of that estate; they may indeed think themselves tyed to return to God by Repentance; but may they not easily be deluded to neglect it, thinking themselves certain before hand that they shall do it? Which if it be considered, the danger of the mistake will appear no less, than that which the Doctrine of the Council of Trent threatneth.

*How Salvation  
is concerned in  
the matter of  
Free Will and  
Grace.*

As for the Question between mans free Will and Gods Predestination and Grace; taking it by it self, as not complicated and twisted with the other, concerning *justifying Faith*; the difficulty of it being so great as it is, the true resolution of it, which is the reconciliation of Grace with Free Will, can by no means seem to concern the substance of Faith, necessary to be held for the Salvation of all Christians. But the denying, either of mans free Will, or Gods free Grace, may and certainly doth concern it. And therefore the second Council of Orange having determined, as well that no man is appointed by God to death; (and therefore to sin) as, that whosoever perseveres untill Death is appointed by God unto effectual Grace; there appears no necessity, why the Church should run any hazard of division, by decreeing farther in the point; (which we see come to pass in the United Provinces) having that decree, received of old by the Western Church, to settle the bounds of necessary truth.

*Salvation concerned in the  
Sacrament upon the same  
terms.*

Nor is there any other means to settle the necessity of Baptism, and of the Holy Eucharist, but the profession of this truth, for the sense of our Creed, in the Article of *one Baptism for the remission of sins*; the neglect whereof hath occasioned, not only the Sects of our Anabaptist, Quakerss, and other Enthusiasts and Fanaticks; but hath given Socinus ground enough

nough to count Baptism indifferent: And some of our Fanaticks, to think it a meer mistake, that any man was ever baptized with water to make him a Christian, since the ceasing of *Moses* Law and *Johns* Baptism. As for the Sacrament of the Eucharist; that which concerneth Salvation in it is manifest, admitting the Premises. Namely, that they who make good, or revive the Covenant of their Baptism, in receiving it, shall receive the body and blood of Christ; and by consequence his Spirit, hypostatically united to the same; to enable them to perform it. To which purpose, it must needs be requisite, that this tender be attributed, not to the Faith of him that receives; (though the tender must needs become frustrate without it) but to the Faith of the Church, and the act of that Faith, in executing the order of our Lord, and deputing the Elements to be the body and blood of Christ by Consecration, before the receiving of them. This who so holds, shall neither be engaged, either to Transubstantiation or Consubstantiation; nor yet to hold either of both destructive to the Salvation of them that are bred in them; holding that which is necessary to Salvation: Namely, the renewing of the Covenant of Baptism, in and by the Communion in the holy Eucharist. As for them who, abhorring Transubstantiation, communicate with Consubstantiation; it is enough that I say as afore; that they weigh not by their own Weights, nor mete by their own Measures. For how is it more destructive to the Grace of the Sacrament, that the body and blood of Christ is thought, from the Consecration, the subject of the accidents of those Elements that once were; than that they should profess the same dimensions, which the substance of the Elements filleth: And that, not by virtue of the Consecration, but of the Hypostatical Union of the flesh and blood of Christ with his God-head? But the error of the *Sacramentaries*, taking this Sacrament for a meer sign, to confirm a mans Faith; leaving it indifferent whether consecrated or not, leaves it also indifferent whether used or not; though the *Socinians* only own the consequence. But if the Faith which it confirmeth be thought to be the assurance of a mans Predestination, then involveth it the Herefie of the Fanaticks.

As for the rest of those Ordinances, which the Church of Rome counteth Sacraments, as well as Baptism and the Eucharist

*The abuses of the Church of Rome in confirmation.*

rist, though not to the like effect ; It is manifest, that they tend all of them, to a wholsom Communion in the Holy Eucharist. Confirmation was, for many hundred years, given after Baptism, before receiving the Eucharist ; which was to be received by those that were baptized, upon their Baptism. If the Bishop himself baptized them, (as usually he did baptize those that were baptized in the Mother-Church, at the usual times of *Easter* and *Whitsontide*) then did he Confirm them immediately. If they were baptized in their Parishes ; which fetched Chrism from the Mother-Church, on *Maunday Thursday*, in token of the licence to baptize, which they had from the Bishop ; they were brought to the Mother-Church to be Confirmed. A manifest sign of that which I said : That Confirmation is reserved to the Bishop, because his authority it is, that must allow the baptized to be of the number of the Church. For whereas the Gift of the Holy Ghost, promised in Baptism, depends, never the less, upon the continuing of the Baptized members of Gods Church : It is strange, that the Holy Ghost, which Baptism promisseth a Christian as a Christian, should be given him again by Confirmation, as a Member of Gods Church ; when he that believes and lives as a Christian otherwise, cannot have the Holy Ghost, unless he continue in the Church, over and above ? Now that all are Baptized Infants, how necessary it is, that Confirmation should pass upon them, before they come to receive the Eucharist, I need not dispute ; both sides acknowledging, that as well the trial of their knowledg, as the exacting of their profession, in Christianity, is a thing due unto them from the Church. And therefore, in the Church of *Rome*, where this substance of the Office is not provided for, it is little more then a shadow ; Professing Unity with the Church, by seeking the Bishops blessing, but neglecting the reason for which the Unity of the Church is provided by God for the Salvation of a Christian ; to wit, the exacting and allowing of his Christianity.

In the other  
four Offices.

All Ordination tends to the Celebration and Communion of the Eucharist ; as well that of Bishops, to the intent that they may Ordain the other Orders ; and that of Deacons, that they may wait upon the Celebration of it : As that of Priests, that receiving the Power of the Keys, to warrant the effect of it, they

they may therefore have power to celebrate it. Whereby it may appear how great an abuse it is to this Ordinance, in the Church of *Rome*, that a Priest is Ordained to sacrifice for quick and dead: Understanding, *for the dead*, to deliver their Souls from *Purgatory* pains to the sight of Gods face: But *for the living*, that all that assist, (or assist not, so the Priest intend them) though they mind not what is done, much less understand or assist it with their Devotions, by virtue of the work done, have the Sacrifice of Christs Cross applied to them, to such effect as the Priest shall intend. Whereas the Celebrating of Ordination with the Communion of the Eucharist signifieth plain enough, That the Grace of ministering aright the Office which they receive, depends upon the Christianity which they profess to receive it with, by communicating in the Eucharist; as well as the effect of it, upon the Christianity of those to whom they shall minister the same. As for the ministering of the Keys of the Church in Penance, whether publick in notorious sins, or private for the assuring of those which are not notorious, that they have right to the Eucharist; you see it tends still to Communion in it. And you may as easily see, how great is the abuse of this Ordinance in the Church of *Rome*, when it is taught, That submitting to the Keys of the Church by confession turneth imperfect sorrow for sin, (or as some say, sorrow for the guilt of punishment, not for the offense of God, which they call *attrition*) into *contrition*; which is that sorrow which intitleth to forgiveness. Whereas the power of the Keys is ordained to procure this sorrow, by barring a sinner from the Communion, till it appears that he hath it; not that submitting to the Keys, *ipso facto* he hath it. And upon this abuse there hangs a second; that when the sinner undertaking the Penance enjoined to make his conversion to appear, is thereupon admitted to the Communion, before the performing of it; (for which there may be many reasonable occasions, though not according to the Primitive Rule) the performing of it is thought and said, not to pretend the qualifying of him for pardon, but the redeeming of Temporal pains, remaining due after sin is pardoned; and therefore to be paid in *Purgatory*, if not satisfied here. Things whereof there is no mark in the Faith and Practice of the Catholick Church. The Unction of the sick, I have shewed,

shewed, to be only an appendage of the Ministry of the Keys, in that estate, tending to the recovery of bodily health. And therefore called *extream Unction* by abuse, in the Church of *Rome*, as if the intent of it were to prepare against the conflict of Death, with the Spiritual enemies of the Soul. For though the Church ordaining prayer for bodily health, can by no means forget the health of the Soul, if it mean to remember the Common Christianity: Yet appeareth it, nevertheless, what ground and occasion the Institution of St. *James* pretendeth. And so it appeareth, what dependence the Unction of the sick holdeth upon the Communion of the Eucharist. As for the Marriage of Christians, if it be under a peculiar Rule, by virtue of the Common Christianity; and that the interest of the Church, in allowing of Marriages, is grounded upon the same; it is far from any imputation of abuse, that the Church of *Rome* celebrateth the same at the Eucharist. For seeing our Christianity is particularly concerned in the duties of Marriage; how should the Grace of God, enabling to discharge the said duties be expected, but by reviving the obligation of our Common Christianity; which the receiving of the Eucharist signifieth? I will not undertake to clear the See of *Rome* from all abuse of Ecclesiastical Power, in multiplying the Impediments of Marriage, as beyond necessity, so beyond the Interest of Christianity; and in dispensing in them again, for favour or for reward; as having been prohibited for no better reason then this; that power appears most, in that which there is least reason for. On the other side, dispensing in those degrees which the Law of *Moses* prohibiteth, and therefore Christianity ought to be farther from allowing: It seemeth to stretch the Power of the Church beyond the bounds of it. And thus it appeareth, first what relation these Offices hold with the Eucharist, and the Communion of it; and then what is the point of Reformation, in which the voiding those abuses standeth.

*The Reformation pretended no less abuse, on the other side.*

On the other side, they that now are content with Confirmation, so they may have the giving of it themselves, and the Catechizing of them that receive it, after their mode; not distinguishing themselves from the Fanaticks, cannot be presumed to Catechise according to the Christianity of Gods Church. But in as much as they Usurp unto themselves authority without



out their Bishops, and against them; they cannot make Members of Gods Church by the Confirmation, which so they may give. So they bar the gift of Gods Spirit, which Baptism promisseth a Christian as a Christian, by barring the Unity of Gods Church. Again, Ordaining all whom they Ordain to one and the same Office of *Preaching the Word, and Administring the Sacraments*; first, they usurp the power of Ordaining, which they never received any Authority by their Ordination to exercise; and that in despite of their Bishops, as seducing the People from the way of salvation, which by their Ordinations they pretend to teach. So receiving no Power of the Keys by their Usurpation, they receive no power to celebrate the Eucharist; but only to commit Sacrilege by profaning so high an Ordinance. And then they tread under foot the Hierarchy of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, in despite of the whole Church, dividing the Authority of their Bishops among themselves; but abolishing the Order of Deacons by confounding the title of Ministers, common to all three Orders, for ministring their several Offices; with that sense in which the lowest Order are called *Deacons*, for ministring to Bishops and Priests in their Offices. As for the power of the Keys, which is not that which God left his Church, unless the effect of it be the binding and loosing of Sin; it is plain enough, that under pretense of taking away the scandal of notorious sin, they would have power to shame and domineer over their Neighbours overtaken with sin; but without pretense of curing their sin, for the condition upon which they are restored. Such Discipline goes no further than the outward man, and the restraining of him from sin for shame of the World. The presumption of a voluntary change in the inward man, for hope of Gods Grace by the Sacrament of the Eucharist, must be the effect of the Keys of Gods Church. As for this Power in sin that is not notoriouse, what do they pretend more than their Preaching? Which whether it be such as shews the cure of sin, let their diligence in Preaching Mortification witness. And yet, whether every Christian can learn, or will be induced, meerly by Preaching to use that Mortification which is requisite, let them that are able judge. But what Visiting of the Sick do they pretend, but to pray by them, or comfort them, without ever entring into the



*The point of  
Reformation in  
the Mean be-  
tween both.*

ground of their comfort, upon examination of the Conscience? The blessing of Marriage they have reserved to the Church; but upon an ungrounded presumption, that the Marriage of Christians is to be ruled by the Law of *Moses*. The insufficiency whereof being discerned by the people, when they were loose from the Law of the Land, hath occasioned all the Incests, and other disorders of these late times. In the mean time, whereas all these Offices are either provided to bring Christians to the Eucharist, or to be celebrated with the Eucharist: It is demanded, that godly Ministers be not tied to celebrate the Eucharist above thrice a year. It should rather be demanded, how they come to be counted godly Ministers that demand this.

I shall not need to say, how the point of Reformation is found, through which the line of it is to pass in these particulars. Confirmation fitteth for the Eucharist, by the profession of Christianity, and by being a Member of Gods Church. Ordination giveth some degree in the Clergy above the People, and therefore supposeth the profession of retiring from the World, more than other Christians undertake to do. The Eucharist conveyeth Gods Spirit, for the performing of this profession, sincerely and resolutely made. Both requiring the Unity of the Church, both are to be ministered by that Authority, without which nothing is to be done in each Church. The reconciling of notorious sin, is the Bishops peculiar. The Priest hath authority to cure that which is made known to him: but this Authority is not arbitrary in either of both. The rigor of ancient Discipline by the Canons of the Church, is quite out of force; but in these lees and dregs of Christianity, which now we draw, there is some reasonable ground to presume upon, that a Sinner is resolved to live a good Christian for the future. Let that be limited, and the power of the Keys will have effect in barring the Sinner from the Communion, till the presumption be visible in him. But to what shall the Keys of the Church reconcile him, when the Eucharist is celebrated but thrice a year? To what purpose is the visiting of the Sick, but that, upon such presumption, they may have the Eucharist to maintain them in the great Journey which they are going? The duty of Marriage among Christians depends wholly upon this supposition, That God gives the Married an interest in one anothers body,

body, which cannot be dissolved but by death. Therefore it is celebrated with the Eucharist, that they who marry with the resolution of Christians may be enabled by the Spirit of God, which the Sacrament promiseth to perform the same.

The charge of Superstition upon the Church of *Rome* is to be justified by many particulars, in tending those things to God for his service, wherein his service consisteth not. In the first place, the multiplying of Masses for the quick and for the dead, without any pretense of the concurrence of a Congregation to the action, much less of any Communion. At this rate, it matters not much in what language it is performed, seeing there is no mans devotion required to assist the Priest in it. The like is seen in the Vows of Pilgrimages, and in the Visiting of divers Churches, for the gaining of Indulgences. For had men nothing else in mind then that Service, which is acceptable to God in all places; why should they think themselves more acceptable to God for the travel which they undergo, that they may perform it far from home? whereby they forgo that opportunity for it, which they know, without bettering the mind; which, were it as it might be, would find means to better it self every where. But there appears in it a carnal affection to the Memories of Saints, out of a carnal affection to the things of this World, wherein carnal men hope to be assisted by the Saints, in recompence of their voluntary devotions, though Christianity allows them not the confidence to seek them at Gods hands. The same is to be said of an innumerable number of things that Monastical Orders observe; nay, of the overvaluing of the estate it self of continence or retirement from the World; which being no part of Christianity, but a help and an opportunity for that wherein it consisteth, satisfieth outside Christians with that which Pagans can do, the outward work, without that inward disposition which only Christianity formeth. All these, and many more observations, which they set innocent Christians on work about, must needs speak them superstitious; notwithstanding that there is always in them a pretense of serving God, according to Christianity. For the more straw and chaff, the less grain; and where the intention of the mind is spent upon the shell of Christianity, there can it not have strength to bring the kernel of it to ripeness.

*The Superstitions of the Church of Rome.*

ness. The Ceremonies wherewith they overcharge the publick service of the Church are of the same nature: For they that understand not the meaning of them; and therefore distinguish them not from the Office which God accepteth, must needs put that to the account of his service, which is but the means to procure it.

*The Superstitions of the Puritans.*

But what shall we say to them, who think they oblige us when they allow the People to kneel, to lift up their eyes, and hold up their hands at their Prayers? Do they not think they oblige Almighty God, in serving him without any other sign of Reverence? It is not possible, that they should stand upon it to the disquiet of the Church, if they did not. Did they not take it for the service of God, that the same Houses should be Common and Holy, Seables and Churches, the same Vessels, Chalice and drinking Cups, the same Tables, Altars and dining Boards, it is not possible that they should trouble the Church about it, as they do. But it is plain enough, that they serve him without reverence or devotion, because they think so. To these men, all set times of Fasting, all the estate of Continence, all obedience to Superiours, all works of Mortification and Penance, stand suspected for Superstitious. They would not think themselves far enough from the Papists, if they should do the good works of Christians. For fear of private Masses, the Eucharist must be celebrated thrice a year. And we must have the *Opus operatum* of a Sermon, in exchange for the *Opus operatum* of the Mass. But this is not reforming of Religion: It is stocking up the Vineyard of the Church instead of Pruning it. I need not say what is Reformation, and at what point it stands. The distance from the extremes makes the mean visible. The truth is, there will be necessarily Superstition in all Religions, so long as the Church hath chaff and corn in it. For they that are sensible of that obligation to God, which they are not willing to discharge, will always discharge themselves to God upon that which they are content to do for his service; but which he is not content with, because it signifieth not the obedience of the inward man, which he requireth. Not that there must needs be Superstition in using things indifferent of themselves; much less in using such, as in reason may serve to advance attention and devotion in God Service. But because, as there may be Superstition

stition in using them: so there is Superstition in thinking, that by forbearing them a man does God service. But to think Schism acceptable to God, rather than use them, is without doubt as great Superstition as any the Church of Rome teacheth.

Having shewed, why the Church of Rome cannot be charged with Idolatry, I may from thence infer, that the Pope cannot be Antichrist. I do not grant, that either St. Paul, in the second Chapter of his second Epistle to the *Thessalonians*, or St. John in the Apocalypse speaks any thing of Antichrist. But he that exalts himself above all that is called God, as St. Paul speaketh there, must be one that should make himself God according to the Idolatry of the Pagans. And the Fornication which the Whore of *Babylon*, in the Apocalypse, makes the Nations drunk with, is necessarily the same Idolatry. Therefore if the Pope teach no such Idolatry, he cannot prove Antichrist either by St. John, or St. Paul. The Fathers have thought, that both of them prophesie of such a one as shall indeed be a false Christ, if ever there shall be such a one; because he shall impose a new Religion, as from God, upon all whom he shall seduce. But St. John's Catholick Epistles, where Antichrist is mentioned, do not signifie that any such is to come. And therefore we are not tied to their opinion in the interpretation of a Prophecie, which is no matter of Faith.

But though the Pope be not Antichrist, nor the Papists Idolaters; yet I conceive I have shewed sufficient reason, why this Kingdom and Church of *England* might and ought to reform Religion, without and against the consent of the Church of Rome; supposing that which seems to be manifest by all that hath followed; that the Church of Rome would never have condescended to any such change. And the Unity of the Church determining the measure and the bounds of Reformation, they must needs be the same indeed, as they would be, were the Pope Antichrist and the Papists Idolaters; though to those that believe them so, because they believe them so, the measure and the bounds of Reformation will never appear to stand where indeed they do. But let them look to the consequence of their own imaginations. This one must needs render them Schismatics to God, abhorring communion upon imaginary reasons; but will render us with them

*Why the Pope cannot be Antichrist.*

*How it is just to Reform without the See of Rome.*

them Schismatics both to God and to his Church, if we make all that to be Reformation, which their imaginations, tainted with such a prejudice, would have to be Law to this Church and Kingdom.

## C H A P. XXII.

*The present State of the Question concerning our Service. The Reformation pretended, abominable. Such Preaching and Praying as is usual, a hindrance of salvation, rather than the means to it. What Order of Service the continual Communion will require. What form of Instruction this Order will require. Of that which goes before the Preface, in our Communion Service. Of the Prefaces, and the Prayer of Consecration. Of the Prayer of Oblation, and the place of it. Of the Commemoration of the Dead, in particular. Why the Communion Service at the Communion Table, when no Eucharist. A secondary Proposition, according to present Law.*

*The present State  
of the Question  
concerning our  
Service.*

I Conceive I have, by this time, shewed a reason for that which I said in the beginning, That there is so much in question between us and the Puritans, (comprising in that name all the parties into which it stands now divided) as if it were decided for them, would give the Papists the advantage against the Protestants. Now as for the great question amongst us, concerning



cerning our Service; if it were truly stated, it would soon be at an end. If it may be once considered, that the question is indeed and in truth, Whether Sermons shall drive the Communion out of the Church, or not? Whether or no arbitrary Prayers in the Pulpit shall chase out of the Church those which St. Paul commanded to be made, and the Church by his command hath frequented ever since; I conceive the Dispute would be easily decided? And that is the thing in question indeed and in effect, how little soever it appear. Certainly, if there were never any Common Prayers made in the Pulpit; if there were always Common Prayers made at the Altar; they who had no Common Prayers but at the Eucharist, had the Eucharist as oft as they had Common Prayers. Not as if the Church did never assemble, but when the Eucharist was celebrated. But because their desire and endeavour was to celebrate the Eucharist once every day; and that in the morning, unless it were a Fast; and always at dismissing the Assembly, as the principal Office of it. For hence the Eucharist came in time to be called *the Mass* (which had formerly been the name of the Assembly it self) from the *dismissing* of it. And they who endeavoured to celebrate the Eucharist every day, were not like to let Lords days and Festivals pass; or think them solemnized, as they should be by Christians, without it.

Since therefore I claim, that this came by Tradition of the Church, from St. Pauls order, I will infer no less than I have proved, That to change the Communion every Lords day and Festival, together with Morning and Evening Prayer every day in the Church, and that with the Litanies upon Wednesdays and Fridays, which the Law of the Land hitherto requir-eth, for two Sermons every Sabbath, with arbitrary Prayers afore or after them, would not be Reformation, but Apostasie. For it is manifest, that at the Reformation the Eucharist was in possession in all Churches, though the Communion had been surceased. Nor was it ever accepted, that the frequenting hereof had in it any colour of abuse, or abatement to that very Christianity, which we receive from our Lord and his Apostles. The abuse was in private Masses. It was also a just complaint, that the people were not taught their duty out of the Holy Scriptures; and that the instructing of them by preaching was neglected;

*The Reformation pretended, abominable.*



neglected, beyond all reason and conscience. But was it ever pretended, that the reforming of the abuse in private Masses consisteth in two Sermons a Sabbath; (for we must speak like Jews, if we will not offend tender consciences) with the Prayers of the people, such as the Minister shall please, before or after it; which is the Reformation now pretended? Had it been said that this is Reformation, when abuses were so visible, that the name of Reformation was popular; it had been easily answered, That this were to bring the chief Office of Christianity to little or nothing. And therefore if this be the form that was called Reformation in some places, it must be said, that it was easier to see what ought not to be, than to settle what should be. But for a Christian Kingdom, having upon deliberation settled an order, whereby the Eucharist is to be celebrated all Lords days and Festivals; for Reformations sake to leave Ministers of tender consciences free, not to celebrate it above thrice a year; (and that having a competent number to communicate, which may be not once in seven years) as now is demanded; I hope it shall never be said in the streets of *Gorb.* that it past undetected.

*Such Preaching  
and Praying as  
is usual, a hin-  
drance of salva-  
tion, rather than  
the means to it.*

It is necessary for him that is come to the state of salvation, as a Christian, to learn how he is to live as a Christian; and to grow every day in the knowledge of his duty, that he may discharge it. But shall he be able to do this by hearing two Sermons every Sabbath, and as many more, as if he did nothing else? Or may he not be able without it? Certainly, that which their Preachers now do is so far from being necessary, that it is no fit means to the salvation of the generality of Gods People. They may easily make it a trade never to fail, to while out an hour or two in the Pulpit in discoursing the meaning of their Text, in framing Doctrines out of it, and proofs of those Doctrines, (more plentiful a great deal, when they are so manifest that they need not, than when they are so obscure that they cannot be proved to the generality of Christians) and upon these Doctrines and Proofs, Exhortations, Invectives, Instructions, Reproofs, such as the driving of Faction shall require; and yet he that would learn his duty, shall be as far to seek after many thousands of such Sermons, as afore. And yet it shall be an act of no less charity, to Preach a Sermon of Christian

Christian instruction, and exhortation, in and to the known duties of all, or the generality of Christians then it hath always been reputed by Gods Church. But let not a man therefore think, if he have any doubt in some difficult point of Doctrine, in some nice case of Conscience, in the meaning of some leading text of Scripture, that he is to depend upon the Pulpit for resolution in it; where it is easie (as St. *Gregory Nazianzene* answered St. *Jerome*, about the *σαββατον δευτερον* in St. *Luke*) to make you believe, by the pleasing delivery of Language, that you have satisfaction; and yet when you come to seek where it lies, remain in as much doubt as before. And if you hackney out Ministers to two Sermons a Sabbath; the people must not expect that from them in private, which they cannot expect from the Pulpit. But if it be thought part of the instruction due to Gods people, to make the Laws of the Church, and of the State, and the proceedings of publick Government, a subject for the Pulpit; In which, as I said, it is not possible for particular Christians to be satisfied, by all the Inquiry they can make in private; then what may come to pass I need say to no man, that hath seen what hath come to pass amongst us. I let pass less abuses of vain-glory, priding it self in the volubility rather than Eloquence of Language, and rendering more able Curates, not so ready speakers, contemptible to their people; and the like. In which regard, it may many times be questioned, whether the gifts of praying and preaching, which we hear so much of, be Gifts of Gods Spirit which ordinarily suppose Christianity; or of the evil Spirit which always put it to flight. For all that I have said, of the bad effects of Preaching, is to be understood much more of those prayers, whereby evil doctrine is repeated to God, for a blessing of his Spirit upon it. For Christian people, being weakly superstitious; as the generality of all people are; are apt to place the bond of that Religion, wherein they think themselves tied to God, in that which they see and hear alledged to God in so reverend postures.

That form of Service which we hitherto use hath well deserved all that hath been said, in defense of it; being assaulted by violent hands; even in those parts, in which it ought to be inviolable. Nevertheless, professing, as I do, that the restoring

*what Order of  
Service the  
continual Com-  
munion will  
require.*

of the continual Communion, is such a point of Reformation, that the Church is not to be at rest, till it be brought to effect; I must not stick to declare what will be requisite, to render our Communion Service useful to that purpose. I have said that the word *Liturgy* is proper to signifie nothing else, but that form of Service, which the Communion is celebrated with. But I have shewed also, that those prayers for all states and conditions of men in Christs Church, which are contained in our Litanies, are to be offered up to God, as the celebrating of it. And seeing it was at the Reformation, and is at present, a Law in the Church of *Rome*, that all Christians should be present at Mass all Sundays and Festivals; and that Reformation consists in restoring the Communion: It seemeth to me that the pretense of Reformation is not made good, till the present provision be brought to effect; that the Eucharist be celebrated, all Sundays and Festivals, in all Churches and Chappels. And so that all Christians may be tied to be present; that they may be brought as near as the Church ought to bring them, to communicate. Supposing this the intent of the Church; how should it be attained, without two Assemblies, every Sunday and Holy-day-morning, in all Churches? For let never Sabbatharians hope to make us so perfect Jews, as to bring us to dresse no meat on Sundays. If they could, a Parish can never be all at Church at once. The order of the Church never becomes the Church, till it demonstrate a care of all Christian Souls alike. Between the hours of eight and twelve, there is time enough for two Assemblies. For who would wish that either of them should last above an hour? The Liturgy is an Office consisting of Psalms, and Lessons, intermixed with Hymns: and of the Eucharist, which the common Prayers for all states conditions and necessities in the Church, are to be offered up to God with. Now though that which we call the first Service be compleat for the intent of it, yet I must needs find it too long for this purpose; to allow time, both for the Eucharist, and for the instruction of the people; which I do not intend to exclude out of those Assemblies, which I confine to an hour. And how easie were it, to frame for this purpose an Order of Psalms and Lessons, according to the order of the whole Church; which requires, that the Epistles be read after the Old Testament, and

and the Gospels after them; as in our Communion Service, the Gospel comes next afore the Creed? For there would be room for brief Lessons out of the Law and Historical Books, out of the Sapiential Books and Prophets: And after, for the Epistles and Gospels, (which not only we, but the Lutherans, as well as the Church of Rome, do now use) with Hymns between each, according to the Canon of *Laodicea*, received by the Whole Church.

This is the place for the instruction of the People, according to the order of the whole Church. And truly the greater and more solemn Assemblies may be capable of edifying, by learned and eloquent Sermons, which the generality of Parish Churches (the Edification whereof the Church is to study) are very little the better for. And the endless number of strifes, that arise about the Scripture, and variety of judgments, fancies, and interests, in what is fit to be preached, make the design of Homilies necessary; rather to restrain the abilities of indiscreet Preachers, than to help the inabilities of unlearned Preachers. Only that they be so framed, as to contain a course of familiar instruction, in the whole body of Christian Doctrine; not concerning Faith alone, but all the Chief duties of Christians; which these that we have do not satisfy, though not unfit for the time when they were set forth. And being so framed; though it be all one to the Edification of the Church, whether the matter of them be delivered by word of mouth as every Minister can best insinuate it into the mind of his hearers; or as it may be couched, word for word, in writing; yet will it be absolutely necessary, for the instruction of all, preserving the Unity of the whole, that the Ordinary have account, not only negatively, that nothing be taught the people contrary to the form; but positively, that the whole matter of it be taught the people, in such time as the Law shall determine; to be repeated again and again, for the certain proficience of all. For it must not avail to say; that the people will not come to Church, unless they may be entertained there with variety. Unless the people be content to be conducted by that which is best to save their souls; though it please not their fancies, it shall be but a Church in name, that shall be Ruled by the fancies of those whom it is to Rule. And when the

what form of  
Instruction this  
Order will re-  
quire.

interest of publick peace so visibly concurrerth with the interest of saving souls; it will hardly become the profession of a Christian Kingdom, not to trust God, for the success of that which is designed upon so Christian considerations.

*Of that which  
goes before the  
Preface, in our  
Communion  
Services.*

This is the place where the first Service ended, and the second began, in the antient Church. The Creed follows after the Sermon, in *Dionysius*; who writing a little before the Council at *Chalcedon*, is the first that mentions it in the Service. He calls it an Hymn, and we may call it the Catholick Hymn; glorifying God for the substance of Christianity, with his whole Church. That which we call the *second Service*, following immediately hereupon, was nothing but the Eucharist, and the prayers of the Church which it is to be celebrated with. And that is the reason why I do not think our Communion Service sufficient for those Assemblies, in which the first is too long to be used. For the Office ought to consist of Psalms, and Lessons, with Hymns interposed; of an instruction, and of the Eucharist; with the prayers which it is celebrated with. Now it hath been always the use of Christs Whole Church, even from the Apostles, to offer at the Eucharist, both the Bread and Wine which it is to be consecrated of; and also, what their hearts moved them to contribute, for the maintenance of Gods Service. And therefore the prayer for the whole state of Christs Church is here proper, in regard of those that offer to that purpose; the rest that offer not concurring with their prayers, to that effect for which they offer. The confession of sins afore the Eucharist is seen in some of the antient Liturgies; nor do I find it questioned on any hand, as either unseasonable, or not requisite in this Action. The Decalogue and Answers, which since *Queen Elizabeths* time, we begin the Communion Service with, seem more proper to be placed here, to branch forth the particulars of those sins which we confess. For the Commandments are certain heads, to which men may refer the sins, for which they ask pardon, and grace to avoid them. But there is great reason, why they are not found in the Service of the antient Church. The reason is, because the Decalogue is proper to the Law, and improper to Christianity; and it is a sad effect hereof which we see. For it is certain, and manifest, that the Sabbatarian error hath had the rise,



rise, or increase, from the construction, which ignorant Preachers have made, of the prayer for remission of sins against this fourth Commandment, which the Church prescribeth. Nor have I ever found any authority of the Church, for using the Decalogue, for the Rule by which the sins of Christians are to be ranked; but only in some late Offices, of those ages, which we, who profess the Reformation, are not to own?

After the confession of sins, the *General Preface*, which follows after *Suscipe corda*, would be enlarged, with thanksgiving to God, for making the World and man, for not forsaking man having forsaken him, when he was made Lord of his Creatures; but first sending the Fathers, to reclaim their several Ages, then giving the Law and the Prophets, to instruct his own people in his Service: And when these means took not the effect which he sought, for sending his Son to redeem and reconcile us to him, by the death of his Cross. After this the Proper Prefaces, and the Seraphims Hymn, are of too antient and general use in the Catholick Church, to be omitted; without a mark of Apostasie from the devotion of it, which they express. The Prayer which we consecrate with, seemeth agreeable to the intent of Gods Church; but more agreeable, in that form which the first Book of *Edward* the VI. revived by the Scottish Liturgy, prescribeth. And that memorial or Prayer of Oblation, which is there prescribed, to follow immediately after the Consecration, is certainly more proper there, then after the Communion, ending with the Lords Prayer and the peace, after that. For this is the form of the whole Church, so constant, and so uniform, that I am thereby perswaded, that the close of it; *For thine is the Kingdom the Power, and the Glory, for ever and ever*, being always frequented by the Church, either in terms, or in Substance, in this place, upon that occasion, afterwards, came to be put into the Copies of *St. Matthews* Gospel. For it is well enough known, how many antient Copies, and Commentaries, have it not. But there is not any of the Antient Liturgies, that hath not some form of *Doxology* in this place, either in the same terms, or to the same purpose. And seeing it is manifest that the Kiss of Peace is an Apostolical custom; and used in the Western Church before the Communion; (though before the

*Of the Prefaces, and the Prayers of Consecration.*

Con-



Consecration, in other places,) though the Ceremony be set aside, in regard of the change of times and customs, it should not seem burthensom, that the Christianity is remembred, which it expresseth.

Of the Prayer of  
Oblation,  
and the place of  
it.

But if my Opinion might pass, I would not rest contented herewith. I would enlarge this Memorial, with all the Principal heads of our Litanies, which might seem to comprize the necessities of all estates, and conditions in the Church, according to that measure which the Time would allow. For this would be the offering of Christs Sacrifice upon the Cross, for the necessities of all Christian people; which the whole Church of Christ hath alwaies frequented, from the beginning, without any pretenses of sacrificing him again; no reason requiring any more, then to commemorate that sacrifice. And here would there be room for all private and publick necessities, as well of the Church and Kingdom, of the Diocess, Province, and Country, and the respective Governours thereof; as of the Congregation, and of any particular member of it; and that according to such Order, as the Ordinary may find cause to give, in cases that do indeed require a provision for the Time. The antients, celebrating the Eucharist every day, had by that means, daily oportunity of interceeding for particular necessities, according to St. Pauls order; for such *intercessions* the word *intercession* signifieth. They that consider not the defect which follows upon the decay of this order, are ready to impute the defect that is found, of forms of *intercession* for particular occurrences, to the prescribing of set forms, by the Church; not allowing the arbitrary fancies of Curates. But he that hath known the manifold folly and malice, that our London Pulpits have vented, taking upon them to intercede for what occasions they think fit, in what form they please; will find it absolutely necessary, to redeem the scorn that our profession suffers from such disorders, by banishing those prayers out of the Pulpit. And because the Communion will not be renewed so frequent, as to meet with all those occasions, which in the Antient Church, it did serve for; It must needs be a Christian design, to enlarge the first and daily service with such forms, as may serve for most of such occasions; preventing the offenses which have been. For the hope of prevailing with God, for that which presseth

presseth particular persons, is the charity of the Congregation, in equally desiring the necessities of all Christians. When the Eucharist was celebrated upon some particular occasion, according to the custom of the Antient Church; it appears that the general form was thoroughly observed, the particular occasion only mentioned. The eloquence, whereby the Church hoped to prevail with God, was the devotion and unity, which it celebrated the Sacrament with.

But I must by no means leave this place, till I have paid the debt which I owe to the opinion which I have premised and openly profess, again and again, that we weigh not by our own Weights, nor mete by our own Measures, if believing one *Of the Commemoration of the dead, in particular.* Catholick Church, and enjoying Episcopacy and the Church Lands, upon that account, we recal not the memorial of the Dead, as well as of the living, into this Service. There is the same ground to believe the communion of Saints, in the prayers, which those that depart in the highest favour with God make for us; in the prayers which we make for those, that depart in the lowest degree of favour with God; that there is for the common Christianity; namely the Scriptures interpreted by the perpetual practice of Gods Church. Therefore there is ground enough, for the faith of all Christians, that those Prayers are accepted, which desire God to hear the Saints for us; to send the deceased in Christ rest, and peace, and light, and refreshment, and a good trial at the day of Judgment, and accomplishment of happiness after the same. And seeing the abating of the first form, under Edward VI. hath wrought no effect, but to give them that desired it an appetite, to root up the Whole; what thanks can we render to God, for escaping so great a danger, but by sticking firm to a Rule, that will stick firm to us, and carry us through any dispute in Religion, and land us in the heaven of a quiet conscience; what troubles soever we may pass through, in maintaining, that the Reformation of the Church will never be according to the Rule which it ought to follow, till it cleave to the Catholick Church of Christ in this particular.

I am not to expect, that this proposition will take effect, because some points of it will seem to be only one mans opinion though it shall never be that one mans opinion, further then it appears *Why the Communion Service at the Communion Table, when no Eucharist.*

appears to be the Visible Order of the whole Church, from the beginning, or the necessary consequence thereof, in this estate. For the Church of *Rome* obliging all to hear Mass all Sunday and Holy-day-mornings; and the Reformation of the Abuses which we protest against in the Mass, consisting in restoring the Eucharist; the Reformation will not be able to justify it self in this point, till there be a provision, that all may communicate, as they ought to do. And for the Commemoration of the dead, in the Oblation; though the Reformation under Queen *Elizabeth* do silence it, yet under *Edward* the VI. it was retained. And they who were gratified afterwards by silencing it, do now demand, as for Reformation, that the Eucharist be not imposed upon tender consciences, for fear they should not have room enough; for their arbitrary Sermons and Prayers; which they can never secure the Church, that they shall agree with the Profession of it. What they will demand next, for Reformation, how shall it appear? For the standard of tender consciences is as invisible, as that of *Venners* Spirit, that made the rising for King *Jesus*: And having a visible Rule in the consent of the Whole Church; it will be either want of skill, or want of charity, not to distinguish the remembrance of the dead, which the Whole Church hath always frequented, from the opinion of Purgatory, and the custom of praying to the Saints, which succeeding Ages have added. But in the mean time, the reason is visible why the Communion Service is to be said at the Communion Table, notwithstanding tender consciences; which perhaps, many that mean well do not perceive. If Christian people, being seduced by perverse Teachers, cannot be made sensible of their duty, in frequenting the Communion; the Church is not to forbear calling them to it, and putting them in mind of it. We see there are those, who will needs be *Ministers of the Word and Sacraments*, that have ministred no Communion to their Churches, in so many years. Instead of taking shame upon them, for such abominable contempt of Christianity; this mischief is now *imagined for a Law*; when a Law is demanded, by which tender consciences may not be tied to celebrate the Eucharist once in many years. Take away the Communion Service from the Communion Table, and what mark shall remain of the duty that

that lies upon the publick, to reduce the Law of the Catholick Church, which is Gods Law, into force? What hope of reducing it, if the mark be once blotted out? So much it concerns, to hold up a daily Protestation of the Right and Duty of the Church; and a Contestation with all publick Persons in the Church and State, to bend the utmost of their endeavours to redeem such an inconsequence and *indecorum* in Gods Service, as the silencing of the principal Office in it. And we are alive at this day, by Gods goodness, to call God and man to witness, That if Order be not taken in so great a concernment, the fault will be chargeable on those that do not their parts towards it at the great Day of Judgment.

But if my Proposition may not hope for effect, in the next place I shall wish, that all Curates would agree in that which by Law they may do, so far as I know the Law; or rather, that all Ordinaries would agree to impose it upon them: That is, to divide the Service of God, on Sunday and Holiday Mornings, into two Assemblies, as it stands divided into two Services; that all Housholders may stand accountable for their whole Families, to see that they serve God in the Church, all Sunday and Holiday Mornings, as before the Reformation all people were obliged to do. For though by the present Law there is not provision for all Christians to communicate, yet is there Order for the Service of God by Psalms and Lessons, mixed with Hymns, and by the Common Prayers of the Church, perfectly summed up in the Litanies. And they who shall have performed it, shall have celebrated the Lords day, or Festival with it; though not so like a Christian, as had he been at the celebrating of the Eucharist. The Communion Service might serve as it is for the second Assembly, provided that it be, for the Reasons premised, at the Communion Table. The Homily or Sermon after the Gospel, comprising that Instruction or Exhortation, which is necessary for all Christians, would easily come within one quarter of an hour; were Curates, by the wisdom and diligence of their Ordinaries, restrained from impertinencies, and held to their duties. The Common Prayers of the Church, which are perfectly summed up in the Litanies, if they were used at this Assembly also, they would make the Service of God as compleat, as the absence of the Eucha-

Y

rist

rist would allow, being the principal Office of it. And this is no more than is required by the eighteenth of *Queen Elizabeths Injunctions*. For as the Litanies being used after the Consecration, as that Injunction requireth, would be the compleat Prayer of Oblation, according to that which hath been said: so when the Eucharist is not celebrated, the Common Prayers of the Church for all necessities of all estates of Christs Church, would be as compleatly offered to God by the Litanies, as they ought to be offered when the Eucharist is not celebrated. And this course would take away some appearances of inconvenience, arising from the change of time, and the difference which it hath produced in the use of those Services of which our Office consisteth; which, because common reason understands not, therefore the People may check at: and yet Superiours may not, perhaps, find sufficient cause to make any change for the removing of them. The extream length of the Office, as now it is used, is to be counted in the number of these. Besides in that case, there would be no necessity of a Prayer before the Sermon; which now bringeth this visible inconvenience, that the Prayer for all states of Christs Church, which is to follow next after the Sermon, goeth before the Sermon also. For that Prayer which the LV Canon enjoyneth, is to the very same effect with that which is to follow after the Sermon, for the whole state of Christs Church. As for other arbitrary Prayers, before or after Sermons, we are all witnesses what a Trumpet they were of the late Civil War; what a means to prepare the minds of People to it. And therefore if, after so fresh experience, the State shall suffer the Church to leave any room for them in the Order of Gods Service; the State as well as the Church must be *felo de se* in doing it: And they that shall insist upon such demands, do neither more nor less than ask leave to do the same again.

An Objection  
in it, answered.

Indeed it is easie to foresee an appearance of inconvenience that might be objected, if this course should be put in practice: For when the Eucharist is not celebrated, the Litanies then must follow next after the Prayer for the whole state of Christs Church; the substance whereof is the same that is repeated again in the Litanies, as containing more briefly the sum of that, which in them is branched out into more particulars. The practice of the ancient

ancient Church furnishes the Answer. The XIX Canon of *Laodicea*, ancients without doubt than any form of Liturgy extant, prescribes two Prayers to be made just before the Consecration, *ἡ δὲ προσευχή*; that is to say, The Deacon bidding the People pray for the necessities of the Church, which he did name to them from point to point. That this is the meaning of the Canon, we understand by all the Eastern Liturgies. For there is none of them in which the same Prayer is not repeated again and again; the Deacon inditing to the People the particulars which they are to pray for, sometimes more briefly, sometimes more at large. And in one of them, namely the Latin Copy of *St. Basil's* Liturgy, they are expressly called the *first*, the *second*, and the *third Litanies*. Thus ancient is the Custom of bidding Prayer in the Church. For *St. Austin* also for the Latin Church remembers it when he says, *Cum Communis Oratio voce Diaconi indicitur*, When Common Prayer is bidden by the Deacons voice, *Epist. CVI*. And hereby it appeareth, that it was then thought no inconvenience, that those Common Prayers of the Church should be repeated more than once. For being the chief act of their Assemblies, and the end for which the Eucharist was celebrated; to wit, that by the memory of Christs Sacrifice upon the Cross, all the necessities of his Church might be rendered commendable to God, it is no marvel that they insisted upon them more than once. And therefore if in this decay of Christianity, the continual Celebration of the Eucharist cannot be revived; in the next place it remains, that these Common Prayers be maintained and frequented with as much devotion, as in so wretched times as we see, can be obtained. I have said nothing of that which is commonly called *Preaching*, or of any provision for it; because I say nothing of the First Service, and of the use of it at other times, besides *Sunday* and *Holiday* Mornings. But it is easie for me to say, that there will be as much opportunity for it in the Afternoons, as the abilities of the generality of Preachers can be thought competent to imploy, with that which shall be fit to entertain the People. I know the general opinion inclines to imploy that time with the Exposition of the *Catechism*. But the Doctrine of the *Catechism* is the work of that time, when mens wits are at the best. And if the Exposition be not prescribed,



as well as the *Catechism*, more inconvenience may soon be found in that course, than in the Pulpit.

## C H A P. XXIII.

*How the Law distinguishes Moral Precepts from Positive. How the Spiritual sense of the Decalogue concerns Christians. The meaning of the First Commandment in this sense. The extent of the Second Commandment. Of the Third Commandment. What the sanctifying of the Sabbath signifieth. The meaning of the Fifth, as to Christians. The meaning of the Five last, according to Christianity.*

*How the Law distinguishes Moral Precepts from Positive.*

NOW since this secondary Proposition leaves the Decalogue, and Prayers of it, in the place which now it holds in our Service; I will not leave this point, without expounding the Decalogue in that sense, which the Principle, upon which I maintain the agreement of the Old Testament with the New, requires. For upon that Exposition depends the true meaning and intent of that Prayer, whereby the Church enjoyns the People to ask pardon of God, for their transgressing of the several Precepts; the misunderstanding whereof hath occasioned the Errour of the Sabbath, which only *England*, of all Christendom, is disquieted with. Most Divines do so reason of the Decalogue, (because the most of the Precepts thereof are *Moral*) as if the difference between *Ceremonial*, *Judicial*, and *Moral*, (and much more between *Moral* and *Positive*) were expressly delivered by the letter of *Moses* Law. Whereas indeed and in truth, the Moral Precepts of Gods Natural Law, though of greatest consequence to the everlasting estate of immortal Souls,

Souls, (which the Law supposeth, rather than expresth) are only the matter of the Carnal Covenant, which contracteth not for the doing of them, out of that reason, and with that intent which God requireth; because it contracteth not for the World to come, wherewith that intent is rewardable. For as the keeping of the Precepts materially qualified that People for the Land of Promise: so the keeping of them in *obedience to God, and for his Service*, qualified them then for Heaven, as Christians; always supposing the expectation of Christs coming, for the redemption of Gods People. Therefore, though it be necessary for Divines under Christianity, to distinguish between *Moral* and *Positive* in *Moses* Law; yet they will confound the ground of that distinction, as it took place under the Law to Gods People, if they expect that the letter of the Law should express it.

The not considering of this is that, which suffers not men to see that sense which the plain letter of the Decalogue signifieth; being transported with a prejudice, that the Moral Law signified as much to the *Jews*, and required as great duty of them, as the exposition of them preached by our Lord Christ, requireth of Christians. Whereas by that which I have said, it may appear, that the mistake which our Lord corrects in the meaning of *Moses* Law, is the Heresie of the Scribes and Pharisees, promising everlasting life in recompence of the outward observing of it. Whereas the Law indeed rewardeth it with the Land of Promise, intimating only the reward of the World to come to those, that should serve the searcher of Hearts from the heart, in expectation of the Messias his coming. So the Decalogue, being the brief of those conditions upon which God contracted with the Generality of that People for the Land of Promise, carries not with it the least presumption in reason, that whatsoever it containeth is either *Moral*, or *perpetually Positive*; to wit, according to the carnal sense, which the letter of the Law first presenteth. Indeed, according to the Spiritual intent of it, by which true *Israelites* were conducted, even then, to the World to come, it signified and required the same Spiritual obedience, which the Gospel obliges us to, though in a measure proportionable to those helps of grace, which God then gave; compared with those, which the coming of Christ hath brought forth.

So

*How the Spiritual sense of the Decalogue concerns Christians.*

So that in one word, admitting the literal sense of the Decalogue to be that which obliged the Jews; the spiritual sense, which is to carry with Christians, is to be valued by the correspondence of the New Testament with the Old, in the matter of every particular Precept.

*The meaning  
of the First  
Commandment  
in this sense.*

What can be more manifest than this, in the Preface to it? Can Christians say truly, that God ever delivered them *out of the Land of Egypt, and the Bondage of it?* Must they not all say, that God hath delivered them from the bondage of sin and Satan, correspondent to it? Might not all true *Israelites*, in whom was no guile, say the same in regard of that worship of Idols, which all other Nations were enslaved with, and the sin to which it engaged? Therefore a Jew understands this first Precept to be the chief point of his Law, that he acknowledge but one God; but that one whom his Fathers knew. And if the matter be examined, it will appear, that both *Jews* and *Mahumetans* stand at distance with Christians upon this false pretence, That the Faith of the holy Trinity agreeth not herewith: for the *Alcoran* insinuateth this poyson every where. But the Christian goes farther in the meaning of this Precept; and believing the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, to be that one God which gave them this Precept; believes himself redeemed from the bondage of sin, by the Blood of the Son, and by the Grace of the Spirit: And therefore making the Will of God the ground, and his Glory and Service the intent of all his doings, renounces all respect to the pleasure, or profit, or honour and greatness of this World, so far as it is not the means to serve God; acknowledging, that when he declines from this resolution, he makes his *Belly his God, or his Riches his Idol*, as *St. Paul* saith; or rather the Devil, that offers him some little part of that, which our Lord refused in gross, the God whom he worships.

*The extent of  
the Second Com-  
mandment.*

The Second Commandment setting forth God for a God that is jealous of his People, whether they worship him or not; manifestly supposeth their Covenant, to forsake all other Gods beside him, a contract of Marriage between him and his People. Which if it be so, it is no less manifest, that the Images which the Precept supposeth, are the representations of other Gods, which his People were wont to *commit adultery with*, by worshipping

shipping them for God. For seeing it is manifest, how much Idolatry was advanced by Imagery, (though it may be without it;) there can be no marvel, that there should be a peculiar Precept against it. Wherefore it is manifest, that Jews by the letter of this Precept are tied from all Images, which their Elders, who had the power of limiting what is lawful and what is not, by the Law, should declare to be unlawful. But to think that their declarations ought to bind Christians, were to imagine that Christians ought to be Jews. And the letter of the Law forbidding all Images, at all times, and in all places as well as some; it is not possible to shew, how Christians can be tied from any kind of Image, at any time, or in any place; more than others, by the letter of this Precept. But by the positive part of the Precept, implied in the negative which it expresseth, *Thou shalt not bow down to them, nor worship them*, Christians must needs find themselves bound to that worship of God in spirit and truth, which it is not possible for Jews to think themselves tied to in consideration of the Land of Promise. And therefore having the Word of God for the rule of their worship, must needs condemn the worshipping of God by any imagination of their own devising, for superstition and will-worship; in standing upon that, which God declareth not that he regardeth for the discharge of their duty to him: and in tending him things of their own chusing, for the worship which they acknowledge to be due. For as I said afore, it is not possible, that they who lay such a weight of their diligence upon things of their own choice, should discharge the duty of worshipping him in spirit and truth in that measure, which the comparison of Gods will with our own choice requireth. And by this rule we condemn all excesses of the Church of Rome, in honouring the Saints and their Reliques, or Images; without making our selves obnoxious to the Jews, for any reason to do it with. For Christianity having put Idolatry to flight, which the Law never pretended to do; it is not to be imagined, that the having of Images can make a man take those things for God, which they represent; so long as the belief of Christianity is alive at the heart. For neither was it Idolatry, though it were a breach of this Commandment, for a Jew to have such Images as were forbidden by their Elders;

ders; not taking that for God which they represented. But what honour of Saints departed, or what signs of that honour, Christianity may require; what Furniture or Ceremonies the Churches of Christians, and the publick worship of God in them may require, now all the World professes Christianity, and must honour the Religion which they profess; this the Church is at freedom to determine by the Word of God, expounded according to the best agreement of Christians. For neither is it obliged by the second Council of *Nicea*, or the violent proceedings of the Church of *Rome*, which have brought it into force in these Western parts; nor to the excesses of the adverse parties in the East, which made the setting up and reverencing of Images in Churches to be Idolatry, without sufficient ground in the Scriptures for it.

Of the Third  
Commandment.

Confining the literal intent of the Decalogue to those gross sins, by which all Jews were to understand, that the interest of the Nation in the Land of Promise must become forfeited, as all reason requireth; the taking of *Gods Name in vain* in the Third Commandment, is in plain terms to swear that which is false, as the *Chaldee* Paraphrase renders it. But a Christian takes up *Gods Name* in professing Christianity. And when the World sees him do any thing that agreeth not with his profession, without doubt he takes it up in vain: For there never was any true *Israelite* in whom was no guile, that worshipped God in Spirit and in truth, but he might then understand that he took *Gods Name in vain*; if professing the worship of the only true God, he should live like those that worshipped Idols. Much more a Christian, knowing that he is bound to direct all his actions to the end of *Gods* glory and service, out of obedience to his declared will; must needs know that he shall not be guiltless to God, if they be not suitable to the profession which he weareth.

What the sancti-  
fying of the  
Sabbath signi-  
fies.

It is questioned, how God blessed and sanctified the Seventh day at the creation of all things; the keeping of the Sabbath being first commanded, after the coming of the *Israelites* out of *Egypt*? For some would have it understood by a *Prolepsis* or figure of anticipation, that God in consideration of his resting from all his Works on the Seventh day, when he gave the Law, made that day the Sabbath. Others think, that he sanctified

etified it from the beginning, for a day of his Service ; though the rest which the Jews were commanded , sitting still all the Sabbath, came in force from the giving of the Law. And truly , the memory of the seven days of the week, which hath been preserved among all nations ; who cannot be thought to have learned any matter of Religion from the Jews ; seems to intimate a Tradition of the creation, remaining among them. But it is to be considered , that when Idolatry prevailed, the worship of the seven Planets was a prime part of it ; and Astrology, which appropriates the seven days of the week to them, a great means of propagating the same. And therefore the memory of the creation being obliterated, by the superstition which the Devil had grafted upon it ; the observations of Heathen people are rather to be imputed to this, then to that. And otherwise , there is nothing in the Scripture to answer *Tertullian* with ; demanding of the Jews, which of the Fathers, before the Law, kept the Sabbath. But howsoever, if we be Christians , we must not question, that the blessing which God *hallowed the seventh day with* , is the rest of Christs body in the grave on that day ; by which that rest from the travel of sin, and the punishment of it, which Christianity professeth and promiseth , was purchased for Christians. For upon this ground all the time of the Gospel is that *Sabbath*, which the Jewish Sabbath signified. And the fulfilling of the fourth Commandement , is the rest of a Christian from *all his own works* , *all the daies of his life*. Not that I doubt, that under the Law , the day was to be set apart for the Offices of Gods Service ; but because there are other precepts of the Law *Num. XXVIII. Levit. XXIII.* by which that is provided for. By virtue of which precepts, according to the correspondence between the Law and Gospel, not only the first day of the week is set aside by the Apostles, for the service of God , instead of the seventh day , which the Jews observe ; but also other days of Assemblies, being appointed by the Church, are to be observed by Gods people, for the same reason as the seventh. For even the seventh day it self was observed , and was to be observed by Christians, for the same reason, so long as the custom of the Church required them to observe it for that purpose. Besides, the letter of the Law having forbidden any work up-



on the seventh day; common reason would serve, without any precept of the Law, to infer, that they ought to meet for the service of God, which his people had always professed, when they had nothing else to do. Otherwise it is true, which *Ori-gen* so often chargeth, that they could not assemble, without some breach upon the strict sense of that command; *not to stir out of their place on that day*. And this sitting still is as properly *sanctifying the day*; as the blood of Bulls and Goats, and the ashes, of a Heifer sprinkling the polluted, *sanctifieth to the purity of the flesh*; according to the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, IX. 13. So the keeping of this Commandment, under the Gospel, is the serving of God all the days of a mans life; as our Catechism expoundeth it.

The meaning of  
the fifth as to  
Christians.

When the fifth Commandment promiseth long life to them that *honour Father and Mother*; will any man say, that this promise is made to Christians; that profess to take up Christs Cross, and to lay down their lives for Christ? If he do, let him say, what Land it is which Christians are promised, if it be not the Land of the living; which the Land of *Canaan* figureth; Wherefore it is manifest, that the honours due to the King, and all Civil powers under him, are due by the letter of this precept, as properly comprized in the name of *Father*, according to the use of that language. The obedience also due to the Elders of the Synagogue, is by the Metaphorical signification of the word *Mother*, standing for the *Synagogue*, derived from the terms of this precept. But according to the correspondence between Christianity and Judaism; God is our Father, and our Mother is the Church. And therefore, as in temporal and civil things, he is a rebel that honours not the King; so in matters of Religion, he is an Apostate from the Church, that honours not the commands of it, within those bounds which the command of God limiteth. And thus the five first Commandments; according to the method of Christianity, abridging an infinite number of Jewish Observations into one very weighty precept; enjoyn every one of them the whole duty of a Christian to God; the acknowledging and worshiping of the only true God extending it self to the living as a Christian, to resting from the works of the old *Adam*, and to the honour of God, by keeping his Commandments, as they are delivered to us by his Church. The

The four Precepts that follow are under one and the same consideration, in this place. Murder, Adultery, Theft, and false Witness, are things, that either take away, or abridge the interest of particular Jews, in the Land of Promise. And if the publick were necessary to the multiplying of them, accordingly, the publick interest thereof in Gods promises must needs become questionable. Among Christians, seeing these are crimes which cannot consist with any interest in the world to come; the very first motions of them are commanded to be suppressed and mortified. And certainly, whosoever was inwardly a Jew in Spirit did understand himself bound to abstain from them, not for fear of punishment, but for love of goodness; which love, the love which Christ hath prevented us with, advanceth to that height, which Christianity professeth. But this obligeth us to assign the last Commandment a meaning by it self, distinct from all that which is prohibited by the former precepts. And truly, he that finds not the peculiar Law of the Jews, in the prohibition of *covering another mans wife*, must be strangely transported with prejudice. For Adultery being prohibited afore; coveting another mans wife cannot be understood, but by sowing seeds of dissensions, and other ways of inticing, whereby a man may seek to make another mans wife his own, by the Law of the Jews; which allowed a man to put away a wife that pleased him not. And therefore the rest of the precept must be *weighed in the same Balance*; to forbid any way of fraud, or force, whereby a man may make his neighbours goods his own. Therefore the matter of this precept is expressed by *μή ἀποσφραγίσῃς* Mark X. 13. And the Jews reduce the precepts of not *covering*, or *lusting* under the title of *rapine* and *oppression*, as ye may see in *Maimoni*. And therefore, whether you restrain St. Pauls *thou shalt not cover*, Rom. VII. 7. to that which this precept forbiddeth; or enlarge it to that which is forbidden by the other four; Christians are, by this precept, forbidden to entertain any motion of lust towards that which is another mans. And St. *Austins* observation; that the sum of the Law is comprized in the first precept commanding the love of God, and the last forbidding concupiscence; is fully verified, understanding the love of God to be commanded by all the five precepts; comprising all of

*The meaning of the five last, according to Christianity.*

them, the whole duty of a Christian to God; but the love of a mans Neighbour, by the other five; forbidding any lust toward a mans own advantage, by another mans disadvantage. And so you see, what a Christian prays for, in praying to God to have mercy upon him, for any thing, wherein he hath offended against any precept of his Law, for the past: and to give him Grace to keep it for the future. In particular, for the fourth Commandment; that if he will pray as a Christian should pray, he must pray to to God to have mercy upon him, in whatsoever he hath not rested from the works of the first *Adam*; begging Grace to do it for the future.

## CHAP. XXIV.

*That no Clergy-man ought to be of more Diocesses then one. Of inferior Orders in the Clergy, and their Offices. The conversation of the Clergy, and the use of Church goods. The ground for promotions to higher degrees. The Universities may be serviceable to some part of this Discipline. Reasons for it. Publick fame of sin to be purged by Ecclesiastical process. Sinners convicted by Law not to Communicate before Penance. The Cure of notorious sin the Bishops Office. The Church not Reformed without restoring Penance, Publick or Private. What means there is left, for the restoring of it.*

*That no clergy-  
man ought to  
be of more Dio-  
cesses then one.*

I Have yet two particulars to mention, both much to be desired, for the justifying of that Reformation which we profess. The one is an express Canon of the Whole Church, concern-

concerning the discipline of the Clergy: The other is an evident consequence of the like Canon; in this estate, when Religion is seiled by the Law of the Kingdom; concerning the discipline of the People. The former is the Restoring of that Canon of the Whole Church, which confineth all Orders of the Clergy to their respective Churches. In the Language of this time, it signifieth the voiding of all Priviledges to hold Church preferment in more Diocesses then one. It is the evident consequence of that Order which the Whole Church hath derived from the Act of the Apostles themselves; constituting several Cities, and the Territories thereof, the seats of several Churches and their Diocesses. It is manifest that this Order was in force, (though in a diverse measure in divers Countries) from the beginning, all over Christendom: And that with the like respect to the Churches of Mother Cities, in all Provinces. It is also manifest, that the Canon grounded upon this Order was in force, till the Usurpation of the See of *Rome*, seeking Benefices for their creatures all over Christendom, authorized the dissolving of it, by priviledges, the greatest benefit whereof themselves enjoyed. So that the surceasing of it being an abuse of the Papacy, our professing of Reformation requires the restoring of it.

But the restoring of it will signifie more, then the terms of it exprefs. It will infer the restoring of some part of that ancient Discipline of the Clergy, upon which, the credit and authority thereof, with and over the People, from the beginning of Christianity, was grounded. It is well enough known, how very antiently, how very generally, inferior Orders of Clergy were instituted by the Church, under the Hierarchy founded by the Apostles, for a sence to *St. Pauls* Rule; that *no Novice* should be *Ordained*. For when Christianity was propagated all over; then those that had lived meer Lay-men all their lives might as well be counted Novices in Christianity, compared with them that were grown up from their youth in these inferior Orders, as those that were newly converted to Christianity in *St. Pauls* time. The imployment of these Orders in Reading the Lessons, in singing the Psalms, in attending on the person of the Bishop, and the Orders of their Superiors, in the ministry of Ecclesiastical Offices, was most commonly

*Of inferior  
Orders in the  
clergy, and  
their Offices.*

monly but an exercise for the time. The exercise of their humility, their meekness and patience, their sobriety and content in a mean condition; living upon some small pittance, which the stock of the Church was able to allow, without prejudice to the Poor, was that which made them fit to be advanced to higher degrees. The study of the Scriptures was the employment of the time that remained to spare, from their attendance upon these Ministries. For as for other studies, while Idolatry continued in credit in the World, it was generally suspected for scandalous, to study the learning which Idolaters had brought forth.

*The conversation of the Clergy and the use of Church goods.*

True it is, many of them, not being book-learned, or otherwise content with so Religious a poverty: and living sometimes by their hand-work, (that they might charge the Church the less) as well as upon their pittances, looked not after higher degrees. Others imbracing a Religious life, and having means for their support, thought it a scandal to their profession, to receive any thing from the Church; knowing that what they spared must come to the Poor. And generally, innumerable of all Orders, especially Bishops and Priests, taking upon them their Orders, gave up their estates to charitable uses. For it was scandalous for those that gave them not up, to live otherwise, than those that had nothing to maintain them but the allowance of the Church, did live. But to increase their estates out of Church goods was a thing which the Canons not only prohibited, but made void. For all Canons, from the Canon of the Apostles, to those at this day, in force in the Church of Rome, disable the Clergy to dispose of Church goods by last Will and Testament. The authorizing of the Clergy to marry, brought in upon consideration of very great necessity, must needs derogate from the obligation of that Rule, in point of Conscience. For it must needs infer a right to provide for Wives and Children, which the Church alloweth, out of Church goods. But it can by no means abrogate the same, without altering the State of the Clergy, (professing retirement from the world beyond other Christians) without extinguishing the Interest of the poor in the goods of the Church; both of them subsisting by Gods Law, and therefore by no means to be extinguished. And therefore, it is requisite that the Married Clergy content themselves with a sober maintenance,



nance, and provision, for themselves, and the disposing of their Children in the World, without converting the goods of the Church to raise them estates. For it is utterly a mistake to think, that Church Goods were provided, to the end that the Clergy might equal the port of their parallel Ranks in the Laity, in expence. It is much against the intent of the Canons that the Clergy should maintain familiarity with the Laity, by correspondences in entertainment, or other occasions of promiscuous conversation; such as their Office bringeth not forth. For that *Hospitality* which Parsonages, and other Benefices are chargeable with, is not the entertainment of their equals among the Laity; but the providing for the distressed wayfarers, or those that are from home upon such occasions, as charity requireth to support: besides the casual necessities of the poor, either at home; that would attend upon the service of God, but that their honest labour will not bear them out in it; or abroad, that appear to be in present distress, whatsoever the occasion may be, that puts them to try the charity of Christians. In fine, there is nothing more contrary to the profession of the Clergy, then too great indifference in conversing with the Laity, of what rank soever. For the authority which ought to be in them, for the advising, exhorting, instructing, and reproving of all sorts of People; whom their ranks may call them to converse with, upon occasions which their Office either breedeth, or alloweth; stands upon this ground that voluntary familiarity engages them not any way to approve those actions, which they should rather discountenance.

And this was the ground for the Rule of promoting the Clergy to higher degrees: and in fine to the Bishopricks of their respective Churches. For it is true, by the leave of the Bishop being dismissed, they might hold their degree in another Church. But the expectation of being promoted lay in the trial that they gave of themselves; and in their merit from their own Church. No man could pretend any thing to it, in any other Church, Regularly. How much the translating of Bishops is against the Rule of the Primitive Church, appears by *Constantine* commending *Eusebius* of *Cæsarea*, for refusing the See of *Antiochia*; by the reproaches extant, of the other *Eusebius*, the supporter of *Arian*, for removing from *Berytus* to *Nicomedia*.

*The ground for promotions to higher degrees.*



*comedia.* True it is, it was dispensed in upon great occasions. But every privilege is an exception to a Law. Always, the service which every one did his Church, was that which intitled him to the nomination of the Clergy, to the suffrage or approbation of the people, to the consent of the Suffragant Bishops, and especially of the Metropolitan. This was, and will be always, the Catholick form of electing Bishops. The interest of the Crown is well enough consistent with it; providing a Negative for it; that any man may be refused, whom the Crown shall not approve. The dependence of the People upon their Bishops, which the interest of Christianity necessarily requires, cannot be maintained otherwise.

*The universities may be serviceable to some part of this Discipline.*

The means to bring this education of the Clergy, and by consequence, the discipline grounded upon, out of use, is said to be the erecting of Universities in these Western parts of Christendom. For this was, without question, a far shorter way to the knowledge of the Scriptures, the Canons, and the Rites and Customs of the Church. But it was the way also to loose that gravity, that sobriety, that abstinence and meekness, upon which the credit of the Clergy with the people had been raised. And by that time, or rather long before, corruption in the chief Guides of the Church must needs have rendered inferior degrees conformable. It is not my meaning, to insist upon the restoring of the antient Discipline; which nothing but the wisdom of Gods Spirit, and Tradition from the Apostles, could have furnished the simplicity of the Primitive Christians with. The Discipline of the Universities may be serviceable to the Church, may it be recovered from that licentiousness, and disobedience, which Anarchy hath privileged in youth. I insist upon that which I have proposed already, though no heed is given to it. The general Rule of the Church, to found Bishopricks in Cities, was not every where observed in *England*. Some Diocesses are so large, that the Cathedral Churches cannot be made serviceable, under the Bishop, to the Government of the Whole Diocess. If Colledges of Presbyters were erected in all the Head Towns of Counties, the youth of the Counties that pretend to the Clergy, restoring this Canon, must be under the inspection of the same. If before their going to the University, they were listed under them, as expecting imployment and main-

maintenance under them; that is, within the County; then must they make account to approve their conversations and studies to them, as having no other way to live in that estate to which they addict themselves. As for the course of finding employment and maintenance for them, I will go no further to particulars than I have done. It is enough, that the intention should be, the restoring of the Primitive Canons, as the estate of this time will require or allow.

It would be no small gain, that by restoring this Canon *Reasons for it.* the complaint of Pluralities would be silenced: For that persons whose abilities and trust are approved to the Bishop, by Information of the said Presbyters, should have the care of more than one Church; would be no more inconvenience, than that those Presbyters have a care of the County, the Bishop of the Diocese. Always supposing, that the Incumbent upon the Cure, and the rate of his maintenance be allowed, or rather constituted by the Bishop, to whom that right originally belongs. I will say no more to justify this Proposition, but this, That he who is obnoxious to several Churches, that is, to several Dioceses, either as to the duty of Governing, or of being Governed, can by no means be accountable to both; according to that account, which the constitution of the Catholick Church requireth of every Order and Degree of the Clergy. And again, that seeing all exemptions, priviledging against the Ordinary Rule and Government of the Church, are the effects and consequences of the Papacy, and the Usurpations thereof; that the Reformation which we profess cannot be justified in it self (though in comparison, it may abate of the abuse which went afore) without restoring a Rule of such consequence. But all this while it is no part of my intent, that those who are presently possessed by the Law of the Land, should be presently destituted; but that a course be provided for the future, to which the World may be disposed by degrees.

In the second place, for the justifying of our Reformation, *Publick some of sin to be purged by Ecclesiastical process.* and towards the restoring the Discipline of Penance; it is requisite, that all Malefactors convicted by Law of capital or infamous Crimes, or others of as great malice to God, though not so destructive to civil Society, should stand Excommuni-

cate, when their lives and liberties are saved, till they satisfy the Church of their conversion to God. The Law of this Land providing no other trial for sins of uncleanness, but that of the Ecclesiastical Courts, hath hitherto enabled them to proceed to the trial of publick Scandals, by deposing Witnesses *ex officio*. Which, according to the rest of the ignorance and malice of the blessed Reformation, hath been construed for an Usurpation upon the liberties of Christian people. For it is manifest, that under the Old Testament the Rulers of Gods ancient People were able, every one within the Sphere of his authority, to oblige all men to answer upon Oath in any thing, wherein they should adjure them to answer. For upon this account our Lord himself, being subject to the Law, answered the adjuration of the High Priest. And the Levitical Law prescribeth a trespass-Offering for him, who being adjured to speak his knowledge in any business, should conceal it. This the Jews extend to the adjurations of private persons, if made in open Court. But there is no question, that the Princes and Judges of that People, each in the matter of his Office, obliged their Inferiours to answer their knowledge, so that they were perjured *ipso facto*, concealing that which they knew of any mans cause. Under the Gospel it is evident, that the Bishop in Consistory with his Presbyters, did try all Scandals in the Church, by summoning all persons within the Diocess to witness their knowledge. And that to this effect, That if any man were detected to have concealed his knowledge, he became thereby liable to Penance, as for a heinous sin. And *Constantine* the Great, authorizing by an Act of the Empire, yet extant, the Sentences of Bishops in all causes that should be brought to them by consent of parties, gives this reason for it; Because their Authority was able presently to discover that, which Civil Courts could not bring to light by tedious Suits. Whereby it appeareth, that all Christians found themselves tied to answer the truth, which their Pastours summoned them to declare, for discharge of their conscience. Christianity being corrupted by the coming of the World into the Church; it might become requisite, that the generality of this Authority should be restrained within such bounds, as emergent abuses might oblige the Law to provide. But when a Power so neer-ly

Jy concerning Christianity, is cried down for an Usurpation upon the Church; it appeareth that Christianity is at a low ebb, if they who understand so little in the Scriptures, or in matters concerning the Church, dare undertake to Reform it. Adultery is one of the sins, which the ancient Church in some places durst not warrant forgiveness; and therefore did not restore Adulterers to the Communion, no not at the point of death. If the Law therefore provide no other trial for it, but by the Christian Court; to take away that means of trial which the Church inheriteth of Gods ancient People, is in some measure to authorize Adultery in a Christian Kingdom; that is, to call down Gods vengeance upon it. Rather it should be provided, that inquisition after all Scandals upon publick fame, might be authorized upon terms fit to prevent abuses, though not for civil punishment; which the Christian Court should have nothing to do with, yet for the bringing of sin under Penance.

And therefore much more, that Sinners which are become notorious by conviction in Court, according to the Civil Law of the Laud, ought not to be admitted to the Communion; without satisfying the Church by performing fit Penance, that God is satisfied. And the Curate indeed seemeth to be enabled by the present Law to refuse all such the Communion; much more, if he be able to refuse those that seem scandalous, till they be tried. And if he do not what he is able to do, must answer God for the Soul which he poysoneth by giving him the Eucharist, who barrs himself the effect of it; his Repentance not being manifest, as his Sin is. But if the Law will not bear out the Curate, in refusing him till he have satisfied; the choice is hard for him that hath a Family, to forfeit his Benefice by doing that, which the Law that places him in it bears him not out in; though the power of the Keys, which he hath by Gods Law, oblige him to it. And therefore there may be hope of mercy for him that is seduced in so hard a choice. But then the Vengeance must remain upon the Kingdom, and upon those that have Power to right our common Christianity, and do not. The Reformation of Ecclesiastical Law, intended under *Henry* the VIII, and *Edward* the VI, hath provided in this case. And he that considers with con-

*Sinners convicted  
by Law, not to  
communicate  
before Penance.*

science, shall have much ado to justify the Title of a Christian Kingdom; where this right is not maintained.

*The Cure of notorious sin the Bishops Office.*

I go no further at present, than this step to the restoring of Penance, whether Publick or Private. I see there is very good hope, that an end will be put to all that abominable merchandize of Publick Penance, which hath been so just a scandal in this Church. Such abuses must be taken by those that value their Superiours as they ought, for Reformed, so soon as they are resumed into the Bishops own hands: For no man ought to be scandalized, that all such sins shall not be put to Publick Penance, seeing it will be in the Bishop, either in his own person, or by committing any difficult case to the most skillful and most faithful of his Clergy; to attain satisfaction of a mans conversion in private, before he restore him to the Communion, by loosing him from his sin. And the conscience of his Inferiours shall stand discharged, ministring the same upon his Order. In the mean time, the Bishops conscience stands answerable to God, both for the Soul that shall perish by being reconciled before qualified therefore, and for the infection of the Church by the sin which is re-admitted before it be mortified. The case is the very same in all sins, taking all for convict of them which the Law convicteth. And therefore in all those which the Law convicteth not, whensoever it shall enable the Church, (as a Law of a Christian Kingdom should do) to convict them by inquisition *ex Officio*, to the effect of curing them by reducing them under Penance.

*The Church not Reformed without restoring Penance, Publick or Private.*

Now it is true, Publick Penance is, and was at the Reformation utterly surceased in the Church of Rome. But Private Penance was in use, as still it continues, (though under those great abuses which I have taxed) as the prime institution of our Lord and his Apostles; though seldom mentioned in the Records of the Church, in comparison of Publick Penance, so famous in all the Primitive Fathers. For the Christian Court being afterwards divided into the outward Court of the Church, and the inward Court of the Conscience; (the one concerning all Jurisdiction to any effect of Excommunication; the other concerning sin that is not Excommunicated, because not notorious, but voluntarily made known;) the sentence of Excommunication being released, a man comes not to the Communion

munion in any case of sin, till he voluntarily undergo the Keys of the Church, by opening that sin in the inward Court, which he puts the outward Court to bring to light. And thus were the Keys of the Church in force before the Reformation, under the See of *Rome*. Now were Publick Penance restored, then might it clearly be said, that a Reformation were effected in this point: for Penance, absolutely so called in the ancient Church, is Publick Penance. Some sins of less consequence, were referred to some one of the Presbyters to be cured in Private, by the ancientest Customs and Canons of the Church; but there is but little mention of them, in comparison of the greater that were restored by Publick Penance. So the restoring of Publick Penance would be effectively Reformation, that is, the restoring of that which was; though Private Penance were not enjoined by Law. And of necessity there would be great hope, that Christians understanding by the use of Publick Penance, the need they have of the Keys of the Church to assure them the cure of their sins; would be moved in conscience, voluntarily to seek that help for the cure of their secret sins: For by that means first came Private Penance into so general use, that it was possible for the Church of *Rome* to procure secret Confession once a year, to be settled for a Law of all Christian States under it. And did the Law here maintain Publick Penance, then were the Heresie of the Fanaticks, and all imaginations tending to any degree of it, quite put to flight; the People receiving this impression from the Law, that their sins which no man knows, but only God, cannot be cured at an easier rate than those which the World knows. But as the matter is, so long as the Keys of the Church are not in force, that is, in use, for the restoring of Sinners to the Communion, upon presumption that they are restored to Grace, grounded upon the works of Repentance which they shew, it is a hard task to maintain the claim of Reformation in the Church: for the Church is founded upon the Power of the Keys. And therefore where that Power is not in force, as during this time of our blessed Reformation; there it is a Church in hope and right, rather than in deed and in being. We publickly profess to seek the restoring of Penance; and because we have not effectively sought that which we profess to seek;

seek;



seek, God hath brought upon us that heavy vengeance which we have felt. The marvellous work that he hath shewed in restoring us, obligeth all to lay it to heart; and never to give over the thought of it, till by degrees it be restored in some measure. Christian Souls perish, because they know not what help they want. The blessing of the Church, and the Communion of the Eucharist, being ministred to all without difference, give no man any ground of salvation by being allowed it. And yet the Church is provided by God, that all may have ground for that hope by being of the Church. All that minister the Office by ministring the same, maintain simple Souls in a confidence, that they want nothing requisite. Whereas it is not enough for our discharge, that any man may, unless there be probable means, whereby all may be saved; but that can by no means be maintained, where the Power of the Keys is not in force.

What means  
there is left for  
the restoring of  
it.

The difficulty indeed of the business appears as much, by the Scandals which the *Scottish* Presbyteries, and our *Triers* here for the very little time they had, have given; as by those which served to bring Auricular Confession out of date. And no marvel: For all the cries for Discipline, which our Presbyterians make, seem to demand, that their Power in it be as arbitrary as their Prayers. No Rules, no bounds, no limits proposed, within which it shall be ministred; which is the difficulty. Nor is it possible to reduce the severity of the ancient Canons, which the Church of *Rome* it self hath abated to secret Penance. And yet supposing the premisses, it will be necessary to follow them in such a form, as the World at present may bear; not referring the measure of trial to be required for the verifying of a mans conversion, to the discretion of a Curate, or a Parish; but referring it to the Bishop, and to those whom he shall discharge his burthen upon, in the Cathedral Church, in those Colledges which I have proposed, or in the Dioceses. And yet it seems necessary to refer the witnessing of the effect to the Curate, and to the Parish: For what can be more reasonable, than to presume of a good effect, when they that see a mans daily conversation attest it? As for the measure; it will be a very great work for the Synods of the Provinces to agree upon such a form, as the Legislative Power of the

the Kingdom may find cause to authorize and put in force. Which were it effected, it would not seem unreasonable to trust particular Ministers with the cure of secret sins; having a Rule before their eyes to direct their proceeding. I say it would seem reasonable, supposing the premises, supposing the Clergy lived in that respect to their Superiours, in that exercise of their Deacons degree, in that sobriety, (furnishing discretion in valuing mens actions,) which their People may have ground to trust their Souls with. For at the present, the blessed Reformation having so far perswaded the People, that the Minister hath nothing to do but to preach, till they be sure of their salvation; who will marvel, that they regard not those who detest such impostures? Nor would this be less benefit to the publick Peace, and the quiet of Superiours, even the Sovereign; who must be content to have their actions scanned in the Pulpit, till there be a course whereby their People may be conducted in those things which the Pulpit cannot, nor ought to decide. The *Scottish* Presbyters have made us understand, how well they understand the bounds of Ecclesiastical Power; how much they desire to attempt upon the Secular, as well in the Pulpit, as in the Consistory. And where this great Ordinance, for the cure of sin, and the salvation of Souls, is not duly maintained, just it is with God to make the neglect of it the seed of publick Troubles; the maintenance whereof would contribute as much to the Publick Peace, as to the salvation of Souls.

## C H A P. XXV.

*Gods Mercies and Judgments require the perfecting of the Reformation which we profess. The restoring of the Ecclesiastical Laws is not the restoring of the Church. Yet are we not therefore chargeable with Schism by the Church of Rome. What Schism destroys the Salvation of what persons, by instances in the most notable Schisms. Difficulty of Salvation on both sides, the Reformation remaining imperfect. An instance hereof in the Cure of Souls departing, by the Order in force. A Supplication for a full Debate of all matters in difference. The ground of Resolution, one Catholick Church, the first and chief point of the Debate. The consequence of it, in Uniting the Reformed Churches. An instance in the having of Images in Churches. An Objection for the Church of Rome answered. That which excuseth the Reformed Churches, excuseth not our Schismatics.*

*Gods Mercies  
and Judgments  
require the per-  
fecting of the  
Reformation  
which we pro-  
fess.*

**I**T will not become a good Christian to think much, that these things are called upon at this time, before this Church be restored to the benefit of the Laws, which the Order thereof is  
to

to be established and enforced. - It will not become any such to say; that the same complaint might have been made, while the Church of *England* was the Church of *England*, and before the late breaches in it; and therefore might be spared, when all ought to thank God, that we may be as we were. For the incomparable mercy that God hath shewed, in restoring the Laws with the Crown, and the Church with both, would leave a mark of ingratitude upon him, whosoever, having nothing to say against the truth, nothing against the great weight and high consequence of the premises; should not think it worth the pains, for all Estates of the Church and Kingdom, to endeavour the redressing of them. Especially the profession of Reformation obliging all, that think Christians bound to stand to that which they profess, not to rest in that which our predecessors had obtained, by the first attempt of it. For notwithstanding the great difficulties, which the extreme factions of Papists and Puritans, in Church and State, had cast in the way of all right endeavours, to perfect the Reformation begun, according to the true ground and Measure of it: We see what a severe account it hath pleased God to take, of all Estates in the Kingdom, for laying aside the thought of perfecting that, which in so high a point as that of penance, they had acknowledged to be defective. I do not intend to say, that the Sacriledges committed under *Henry VIII.* had no hand in this account. For there is no such mark to glorify Gods providence with, as when it is visible, that the punishment springs out of the sin. Nor is there any mean more visible towards the advancing of that confusion which we have seen, then the applying of the endowment of Churches to common uses; being found, at the dissolution, by the irregular Power of the Papacy, in the hands of Monasteries. But of that guilt, the Crown and Kingdom seems to stand in a good measure discharged, by restoring that part, which the Church stood invested of, by the same title, (as we see they have done) to the due property; in such a rate as the publick peace might indure. As for private persons, that stand invested of the like goods by the like Title, there is reason to hope, that their account redoundeth not to the account of the Kingdom, in the sight of God; notwithstanding that the Law alloweth them to use their own conscience, in owning or dis-

owning their Title. For where the Unity of the Church seemeth to be concerned, it hath been always the practice of the Church, to forbear the use of the Keys and to admit those to the Communion, whose actions it intendeth not to warrant; leaving them to answer God for the same, knowing that the Church warranteth them not. The Church of *Rome*, in *Q. Maries* days, followed this patern; reconciling this Kingdom to the Communion thereof, without restitution of that wrong, which it claimed to be done under *Henry VIII.* But if the Kingdom be liable to an account for the sin of Particular persons; in detaining Church goods, and by that means hindring the salvation of Christian People; shall we not think, that the neglect of perfecting the Reformation begun, though obstructed by the difficulty which I have alledged is and ought to be taken for the ground of that reckoning, which God hath made with us? And therefore, that we are not to lay aside the thought of it, so long as there appears any means of proceeding to it. Now it seemeth manifest to common reason, that there can be no such opportunity, for improving the Laws of the Kingdom, by which Religion is to be established; as while the minds of men, after the breaches which we have seen, remain unsetled to any Order in Church matters. For before the breach, there is appearance enough, that all means of doing this were studiously obstructed by the Puritan party in Parliament. And it will appear, if it be well considered, that this is it that made it popular; having always just cause of complaint; (which can never be wanting in any Civil Laws; and therefore, not in those Civil Laws, whereby Religion is settled) but always pretending an unjust way of redressing the same.

But there is a greater reason for us to think, that the Church of *England* will not be restored, by the restoring of those Civil Laws of the Land, which gave force to the Order of it, after those manifest and notorious breaches, which we have seen in it. For it is visible, that it is the Secular power only that is acknowledged, by those that return from their Schism, and conform themselves to the Ecclesiastical laws which it inforceth in consideration of the temporal reward or punishment, which they are inacted with. It is now found to be the sin of Superiors,

*The restoring  
of the Ecclesi-  
astical Laws of  
the Land is not  
the restoring of  
the Church.*

rriors, when such things are imposed upon tender consciences, as they are offended at; not the sin of them who conform themselves to that which is enjoined. And all that hath been pretended, for a change in the Laws, seems now to be made a meer Office of Charity to the Kingdom; that it might not sin, in imposing upon tender consciences, that which they were offended at; who are safe enough from sinning, all the while that they submit to it. In like manner, they who, to be capable of Benefices, get to be Ordained anew; because the Ordination was void, which they had from those who had nothing to do to give it; do profess openly enough, that they do it, not because they thought their void Orders defective; but to obtain the Priviledges, which the Law of the Land annexeth to that Ordination which it protecteth. At which rate, the Oath of Canonical Obedience it self will tye them in conscience, only to themselves; that is, to avoid those temporal penalties, which the Law punished disobeying the Ordinary with. In the meantime, the Fanaticks are owned by them upon all occasions: And not only the Schism of the Congregation is passed over, for a weakness of tender consciences; but that damnable error, of assurance of salvation without assurance of Christianity, the fry that hath spawned all the Congregations of Enthusiasts and Fanaticks; must go for a frailty of the Godly, in professing the true consequence of common Principles. And seeing all severity of Penalties, which may restrain the License of such Conventicles, must needs insinuate an invitation of returning to Communion with the Church, for those who would avoid them: It is much to be considered, that they who shall return, without disowning their Schism; which is of it self always notorious; or the perverse doctrines which have been notoriously owned for the ground of it; do manifestly bring with them their profession into the Church. For returning, only that they may avoid the temporal Penalties which it inferreth, they are at liberty in point of Reputation, as well as of conscience, to practice the Maxim which *Machiavel* teacheth; to make themselves of that party which they intend to overthrow; as not having engaged with the Church; upon profession of Conscience. It is not for nothing that the Rules of the Church, from the beginning, have made



them Hereticks and Schismatics, as to the Church, that communicate with Hereticks and Schismatics. It is not for nothing, that they admit them not to return, without disowning their Schismes, or their Heresies. It is not for nothing, that they admit not the Clergy, that have been involved in them, in their own Orders; But render them incapable of that trust for the future. The reason for all is the same. The profession of the mouth intitleth to the visible priviledge of the Church in communion with it; the sincerity thereof in the heart, to the invisible priviledge of Christianity, with God. And though there be great reason to hope; that communion with the Church and the daily daily use of it may be a means to restore the heart into a right relish of that, which the distance that hath been causeth men to distast beyond measure; yet is there nothing but the solemnity of profession, to render such a change visible. And therefore it will not serve to justify the common cause, till time render the effect notorious.

*It are we  
not therefore  
chargeable with  
Schism, by the  
Church of  
Rome.*

In the mean time, the reason of the distance which we hold with the Church of *Rome*, remains the same; and therefore the measure of it. The abuses which created the necessity for parts of the Church to Reform themselves, without the Whole, remain the same. Only we are left without hope of amendment, seeing the Council of *Trent* received without it. So no terms of reconciliation, but those of conquest; which how should this Church and Kingdom be obliged to accept of; to the betraying of all the Souls, which must needs perish by those abuses? And therefore, allowing the due value of that sin which Schism signifieth, in the party that causeth it; we shall not need to fear the charge of it, though both parties are visibly in the state of it. For the Unity of the Church being next, in consideration and weight, to the substance of Christianity, which the being of the Church presupposeth; the Faith which only justifieth, is seen in making good that profession, which intitleth us to be members of the Church. But that Charity, whereby that Faith is brought into effect, is seen, in the first place, in maintaining the Unity thereof; which a private Christian maintaineth, only by continuing a member of it. So a Christian, as a Christian, fails of his salvation, by failing of that which a Christian professeth as a Christian. But a Chri-

Christian as a Member of the Church, fails of his Salvation, by failing of that which a Christian professeth, as a member of the Church; namely, by forsaking the Unity of the Church. But a man cannot seem to forsake the Unity of the Church, by pursuing the integrity of that Christianity, upon which it is founded. If the corruption thereof be so great, as may seem to render the communion thereof ineffectual, to the salvation of them that use it; it will be Charity to joyn for the restoring of it, to so good an effect; though a breach succeed, by the misunderstanding of those who refuse to joyn for that purpose. Though divers mistakes be committed, in a work of so great weight and consequence; the want of Charity will lye on that side, which shall refuse that reason, which had it condescended to, those mistakes might have been redressed. How much more, when there is no other choise left, but, either to continue at the distance under which we were born; or to give our selves up to the will of those, who not having given satisfaction in the trust which they undertake, condescend to no terms of better assurance for the future?

And truly, though the sin of Schism hinder salvation more then any other sin; because it involveth the body of the Church and so hindereth the salvation of more; yet is there no cause to think, that all who are involved in the state of Schism, are involved in the sin of it. The less cause there is for it, the greater breach of Charity by it. Therefore, the greater, the more visible the causes are, of that change which occasions it, the less is to be imputed to them that follow such causes; Especially to private Christians, when such causes are as visible on the one side, as the interest of each mans Salvation is visible to the contrary on the other side. Besides, I said afore, that Schism in the Church is the same with Civil War in the state of the World. Now though War cannot be just on both sides, for the heads and causes of it; yet for those that follow their heads, in causes too difficult for private persons to judge; it will be no guilt of blood, to follow that authority which appears to them Visible. Which if it be true, as it is evidently reasonable; there will no question remain, that there may be salvation on both sides of a Schism. The Schismes of the Novatians, Montanists, Donatists, Meletians, and perhaps divers others

*what Schism  
destroyeth the  
salvation of  
what persons, by  
instances of the  
most notable  
Schismes.*

others, were grounded upon such causes, as the Unity of the Church did no less visibly outweigh, then the consent thereof to the contrary was visible. Notwithstanding, so long as the Faith remained intire; (as it doth not appear, that they disbelieved, from their beginning, any thing necessary for the salvation of all, to be believed) and the Offices of Gods Service were ministred by them, according to the Order of the Church, as not differing about any of them: I should be as loth to condemn all the partizans, as to excuse the causes of them, to or from eternal death. How much more in the Schismes of the *Luciferians*, of that at *Antiochia* between *Melorius* and *Paulinus*, of that between *Rome* and *Constantinople* in the cause of *Acacius*, and perhaps in others; in which there was only breach of Communion, upon some discontent in the governing of matters in the Church, without either difference of Faith, or in the Offices of Gods service. I confess, Pope *Gelasius de vinculo anathematis*, in the case of *Acacius*, takes it for granted all along, that the want of Communion with the Church of *Rome* rendred all liable to that curse, which Christians, by failing of the duty of Christians; either as Christians, or as members of the Church; do incurr, upon the sentence of the Church. But he who admitteth that constitution of the Church which I maintain, will not easily admit the sentence of a part (suppose all the West engaged in the Act of the Church of *Rome*) able to damn all the Christians of the East, that adhered only to the successors of *Acacius*; not being able to redress his miscarriage, which his successors themselves owned not. Rather is the Church of *Rome* to answer God, for the souls that miscarried, by maintaining the breach open, beyond that which the good of Christendom required. Nay I cannot condemn the opinion of those, who allow a possibility of salvation in the Sects of the *Nestorians* in the East, and the *Jacobites* in the South; notwithstanding that they stand divided from the Church, upon occasion of the Councils of *Ephesus* and *Chalcedon*, which it imbraceth. For it is possible, that they may understand the terms of their distance in such a sense, as may very well stand with the Decrees of those Councils: So that the difference being occasioned by personal contentments; though it were mortal to those who brought it to pass, yet may

may it not be so to those that know not how to help it; if it occasion not the want of means necessary to salvation otherwise. But this is not to say, that these parties are not bound to concur to the visible Unity of Gods Church, by Communion in the Offices of his service. Should they profess themselves free from an obligation concerning all Christians, as members of the Church; I would not excuse those that take upon them to continue such breaches, because they know not that which they should know. But those that are only sufferers in such breaches, I should not exclude from the hope of salvation upon that account; not wanting otherwise, that which is necessary to the salvation of all Christians; which the divisions of the Church must needs render very difficult for the greatest part to obtain. This I would say much more, of the Schism between the Greek and Latine Church; being well assured, that there is no such defect in the Faith of the Greek Church, as may warrant the Latine Church to sentence them for Hereticks. And as for Schism, that the Latine Church; by undertaking more then one part of the Church can undertake; without the consent of the other, in matters of common concernment; hath the greater hand in it; whatsoever the truth be of the disputes that occasion it. And therefore it is much to be lamented, that the See of *Rome* should pursue no other terms, of reuniting those distressed and persecuted Churches unto it self, but those of absolute submission to the dictates thereof, without why or wherefore: Not being afraid to raise them persecution by unbelievers, that they may be necessitated to that submission, which will increase their persecution from their Sovereigns. Seeing then that we have so many instances of Schisms, which exclude not the hope of Salvation; especially for those that are sufferers in them; that is, for private Christians; how far ought we to be from yielding to the unreasonable demands of the Missionaries, charging the Schism upon the Reformation, whereof the abuses which they maintain are the only true cause? For though it was always, and still is a very difficult thing, to see the true point of Reformation; so as to bring those, that feel the abuses, to consent in it; yet the abuses being both visible and palpable, the fault committed by the mistaking of it will be imputable to those, that will condescend to no reason; as well

well as those, who proceed to a change, without due information in the ground and measure of it. And therefore upon that account, there can be no bar to the salvation of private Christians, that are no actors, but sufferers in such breaches; though the misunderstanding of the due ground and measure of the difference must needs occasion the loss of infinite souls, by hindring them of the means that is truly necessary for the salvation of Christians.

*Difficulty of  
salvation on  
both sides, the  
Reformation  
remaining un-  
perfect.*

This is that which I said afore, that Schism, as War, may be unjust on both sides; the charge of which injustice, as it will lye upon those which are actors in it, and causes of it, having power to abate it, and not imploying the same to so good a purpose; so it leaves a possibility of salvation on both sides. And that is no more then hath been said, from the beginning of our Reformation, by all that allow the Church of *Rome* a true Church. But that difficulty of attaining salvation on both sides, which the Schism inflameth, will be imputable to those that maintain the extreams, taking offence at the due ground and terms of composing it. And this, I confess, creates a question upon that which remains for our Ecclesiastical Law to redress. For if they inforce not the due use of the power of the Keys; so great a part of the conduct of Christian souls to salvation; and that it is not to be enforced, without restoring Discipline in the Clergy; How shall it be visible, that a simple Papist sins in being a Recusant? How shall he that invites him to be no Recusant, assure him of means of salvation visibly sufficient? How shall the State be enabled to inflict upon him the legal penalties of his Recusancy, upon other crimes? For it is manifest, that from those whom the Civil Law of the Land qualifies for the Cure of Souls, without any ground of pretence, that they do concur to the true intent of the Church, in ministring the power of the Keys; there is not the least appearance for any hope of that help, which the Office professeth. Indeed, alledging on the other side, those abuses in private Penance, that neglect of publick Penance, which the Church of *Rome* alloweth; we alledge a sufficient reason for a change, without the authority of it; and a possibility of salvation, notwithstanding a defect in redressing the same. But this possibility will consist in the more then ordinary diligence of



of private Christians, considering the snares which division multiplieth; and labouring to supply themselves in that, where-in the publick Order of the Church, provided by God to supply them of it, faileth of the effect which God intendeth. A consideration which though the late distraction made it more visible, yet will always remain in force till the due ground and measure of Reformation take effect.

It will be worth the while to instance this in the Cure of Souls departing this life, according to the Order in force. In the beginning of Christianity, some sins were questionable in some parts of the Church, whether curable by the Keys of the Church, or not. The Schism of *Novatianus*, pretended for the ground of it, the re-admitting of Apostates: As that of *Montanus* in part, the re-admitting of Adulterers. But before all were come to agreement in it, the same severity had been practised in the Church without Schism. They left such persons to Gods mercy: they engaged not the Church in warranting them pardon. The Council of *Nicaea* seems to have put an end to all difformity in the case. There is no mention of denying the Eucharist upon the bed of death, after that. But supposing publick Sinners admitted to publick Penance, thereby to give proof of the sincerity of their repentance, and binding them over to the remainder of their Penance, escaping death. Some Canons go so low as to release sin without revealing it, upon condition of undergoing the Penance it shall require being revealed, in case he shall survive. The Church of *Rome* chargeth all Priests to absolve all at the point of death, which it alloweth not all to do otherwise. As for the Reseration of Penance, they who require Penance, not to qualifie for pardon, but to satisfie the debt of temporal pain, that remains after pardon, I suppose do upon that account, turn it over to Purgatory. But they from whom, as I said afore, there is no appearance for any hope of that help, which the Keys of the Church, ministred according to the Order of the Church, do hold forth; what can we expect of them, towards the preparing of him that lies on the bed of sickness, for his passage? For the comfort which all pretend to give in that estate, may be imagined, to consist in assuring salvation to all that once were assured of it; to all that think themselves sure of it by believing it, not

*An instance  
hereof in the  
Cure of Souls  
departing, ac-  
cording to the  
Order in force.*



by their Christianity, without which their is no assurance of it. If men be not so much Fanaticks, perhaps he assureth them of pardon trusting in the merits of Christ for it. Let him see his sin, let him renounce his own merits, let him trust in the merits of Christ, which he is sure are of more virtue and value than his sin, and the business is done. Not considering what the Gospel requireth, to give a man an interest in the merits of Christ: What it requireth of him, who shall have forfeited that interest by grievous sin: What he hath done, for the mortifying of that concupiscence, for the appeasing of that wrath of God, for the preventing of that sin for the future, whereby he may formerly have committed that forfeiture. Certainly it is no good sign in this case, that our People are so willing to have the Minister pray by them; but so unwilling to hear of the Communion, because they know it requires them to take account of themselves. Nay it is odds, that it is condescended to at the warning of the Curate, who must needs let slip the authority of his Office, in requiring account of him that expects comfort from him, by offering all that he is able to give before the account is tendered. In the mean time, how shall he who prays only by the Sick, and leaves him so, as prepared for his passage; who absolves him of all sin, without being satisfied, that he hath mortified, or that he will mortifie any in case he survive; rest satisfied that he hath done his office, and not dismissed his Patient, insufficiently prepared for so terrible a voyage? Especially being satisfied, that there are two Keys in the Church, as to Christians: That it is to loose no sin, but that which is bound afore; loosing him that appears to be alive, because it bound him when he appeared to be dead afore: That the Blessing of the Church, the Communion of the Eucharist, and the Burial of Christians, ought to signifie some reasonable presumption in the Church, that they depart in Gods peace, to whom it alloweth the same. But where is that presumption, when he that is convicted of a Capital crime, shall be able to demand the Communion of his Curate, without further satisfaction; and perhaps have his Action of the Case against him, if he refuse it? The Curate indeed stands excused by the Law, as to his Superiours, and to the Church. But what will the Law, what will the Church, what will

will the Curates say for themselves at the great Judgment of God, if it appear that a Soul perishes by this defect in the Law, according to the which he ministers his Office? And a Recusant in this case may say with truth, That those abuses which I have taxed the Church of *Rome* for allowing, it commandeth not: That he may possibly meet with one that is not tainted with those novelties of Doctrine, but will deal faithfully with his Soul in that exigent. And therefore may hope that he sinneth not in continuing a Recusant, out of hope for that help in this point, which he cannot expect by conforming. And therefore, that his sin not being visible to him in this point, the penalties of Recusancy, at least in this regard, are inflicted without cause.

Had I not proceeded thus far in setting forth what the justifying of the Reformation which we profess will require, I had not set forth the ground of that most humble supplication, which I advance upon it; together with a more earnest Adjuration (if it be lawful for Inferiours in any case possible to adjure their Superiours) to and of all Estates, whom the forming of the Laws of Religion in this Kingdom may at any way concern; by the bowels of Gods mercies in Christ, by the bitter passion of his Cross, by the merit of his sufferings, by that hope of salvation which they furnish all Christians with; and if the good of this World be of any consideration after so high concerns, by the hope of his Majesties long and prosperous Reign over us, by the blessing of his Return, by the Peace which we enjoy through the same; not to think the restoring of Religion by the Laws of this Kingdom, the work of one sitting of Parliament or Synod: Not to think, that a work of that consequence and difficulty, can be concluded and made up by any Laws, that may presently be provided by any humane wisdom: Not to think the Laws presently provided, so fixed for eternity, that further endeavours for the perfecting of so great a work should be thought derogatory to the authority of Law: In fine, according to that which I said in the beginning, to think the Laws that may presently be provided, ambulatory and provisional, till all possible means shall have been tried, to put so great a work beyond all imputation of any visible offence; not thinking any pains a burthen, that may

*A Supplication  
for a full debate  
of all matters in  
difference.*

shew reasonable hope of a good issue to so high a purpose. For as there is just cause to think, that there remains very much means to be employed with such a hope: so the time now seems proper, now that there is appearance of the restoring of the Ecclesiastical Laws of this Land, for imploying the same. For the means to be imployed will consist in a just and full debate of reason, upon Principles agreed upon between the parties, tending to reduce them unto agreement in such things as remain in difference. This debate may well seem dangerous to Peace, not supposing any authority to govern it within the due bounds, and to direct it unto the due purpose. But supposing, as we must needs suppose, all parties liable to that authority which the Law of the Land authorizes; because that is acknowledged by all parties, neither can the Secular Power allow those whom it owns for Governours of the Church, less than to govern and direct all dispute, tending to satisfy all that question the Ecclesiastical Law of the Kingdom: Nor need they desire more for a reasonable ground of hope for good success. There can be no ground to expect, that they who openly profess the Laws of Religion to be the sins of them that make them, can think their duties discharged to God, by being instrumental in the executing of them to the intent of them that make them. They must needs think themselves bound in conscience to deprave, and to pervert the effect of them to their own intent in an infinity of particulars, which no diligence of Government can prevent or meet with. But when upon full and just debate it shall appear, that a change is refused them, meerly because they can shew no sufficient reason for it, upon those grounds which the common Christianity obliges the parties to acknowledge, condescending to all that they can shew such reason for; how can it be imagined, that any prejudice or engagement that may be so honourably quitted, will prevail above God and their Country, to a defiance of them that *carry not the Sword in vain?*

*The ground of resolution the being of the Catholick Church, the first and chief point of the debate.*

I confess, I can hope for no good end of any such Dispute, without supposing that sense of the Article concerning *one Catholick Church*, which hath carried me through this discourse, for the Principle upon which all matter in debate is to be tried. Nor can I take it for a supposition, which they do admit  
of

of themselves. But I suppose first, that the misunderstanding of that which it demandeth being once cleared, the truth of it will be so evident, by that reason which must satisfy for the truth of the common Christianity, that all shall be convinced of it by that which they alledge for themselves, as being the consequence of their own allegations. Then I suppose further, that it is the first point to be tried, as that which in effect contains more than half the trial of all the rest; which, had it been agreed upon, might have prevented all breaches; and without agreeing upon it, leaves all Dispute in Religion endless, and without hope of conviction or satisfaction on this side or on that. It is not indeed to be expected, that Recusants will ever become a party to such an action; though no way concerned in conscience, nor to own those whom their Sovereign appointeth for Governours of such a debate. Not because there would be any appearance, that thereby they should own them for their Superiours; but because we find them not disposed to own the obligation of their Christianity; requiring them to concur to it upon those terms, to be more ancient than any obligation of their spiritual Superiours to the contrary. For if the Unity of the Church take place before the authority of any Superiours, provided for the maintenance of it; then is every Christian obliged to the due ground and terms of it before the authority of Superiours. And therefore cannot refuse them, tendered by a part, though refused by a greater part. And therefore cannot refuse that trial, which is the due means to bring them to light; though his Superiours refuse it. And therefore their refusal can be no bar to the effect of the action, once grounded upon a supposition enforcing the trial by the Scriptures, expounded by the consent of the Church; that is, within those bounds wherein the agreement thereof may appear. For the settling of those terms upon which the Fanatics are either to be disowned by the Presbyterians, or owned by this Church; as it must proceed upon that supposition, so it will render their Recusancy, as concerning all the consequence of that issue, visibly punishable in those that refuse to give or take satisfaction upon so just terms. And the consequence of the same supposition, in bounding that which is questionable in the Laws of this Church to the justifying of the Reformation

tion which it pretendeth, will leave it without excuse in other matters. For the bounds of that distance which we are to hold with the Church of *Rome* being the subject of distance among our selves; as it is not possible to determine them, but upon that supposition: so they will oblige all Christians to that penalty, which the Laws of a Christian Kingdom are able to inflict upon those that disobey them, being made by virtue of the common Christianity. As for my self it shall be a great pleasure to me to compromise all that I have said, either of the Faith or Laws of the Church, to the issue of such a trial. For there is no reason, why I should think it a disparagement to my age, not to have seen the due consequence of such a Principle in so many matters of so doubtful dispute, better than such a number of Divines on either side, as must be employed in such a debate, can make it appear to those, whose authority must conduct and govern it. That one Principle remaining firm, (which this Church can never disown, if it weigh always by the same Weights, and more by the same Measures) it shall be much pleasure to me to see any mistake of mine, in the consequence of it, brought to light; having a good hope to God, that so innocent an enquiry upon so just a Principle, in a cause so difficult and so concerning, will serve to excuse any such mistake in his presence. The same will serve to difference the liberty which I use in publishing this, from the licentiousness of those who band themselves against the Laws of their Country; they are sure, without those terms for submission to them, upon which themselves cannot deny, that they shall be the Laws of Gods Church in it. Especially seeing I compromise as many hours of study, as much solicitude of thought, as due a course of inquiry into the grounds of the matter in question, as the most of my quality can have employed to the like purpose, since the beginning of our Troubles. And seeing this liberty must be my plea at the great Judgment of God, for any thing wherein I may have ministred mine Office, according to that measure which those Laws will inforce, in which the best of my own private Judgment requires an amendment.

And the acknowledgment of this Principle puts an end to another motion, concerning the uniting of all *Reformed Churches* of all that are called *Protestants*, against the Church of *Rome*, whe-

*The consequence  
of the same in  
uniting the  
Reformed  
Churches.*



whether this trial proposed come to an issue or not. For it is manifest, that before the issue of such a trial with them, as among our selves, all union with them upon account of Religion, is but mutual toleration, providing that no breach succeed; or that none be made wider than presently it is, by the disclaiming of Communion between the parties. And that is to be referred to the wisdom of Superiours, the terms which we our selves ought to insist upon being secured by the express profession of that Principle, whereof they are all but the consequences. We are to stand to *Luthers* appeal to a Council, that should judge by the Scriptures alone; limiting the Interpretation of the Scriptures, as the Rule to judge by to the consent of the Church, as the evidence for the bounds of it. Had this limitation been expressed in their proceedings at home, (as it cannot be said ever to have been disclaimed in their proceedings abroad with *Calvinists*) there had been sufficient ground for preventing, not only the particular breach between them, but the general breach with the Church of *Rome*. There had been no cause why both parties of *Reformed and Catholick*, might not have continued one Church, both *Reformed and Catholick*. Since so great distances are come to pass; as it is in vain to expect an union, without agreeing first upon the Principle of it: so it will not be safe to maintain Communion upon toleration of differences on foot, without protestation for that Principle which must maintain our own Christianity, leaving them to themselves and to God in all matters of difference. If this Union be demanded upon the account of common defence, against the Powers which own the Church of *Rome*, which seems to be the intent of those that would try the cause of Religion by the Sword; the same protestation will bear out all Christian Powers in point of conscience; the interest of their good, and the good of their Subjects being provided for by their wisdom. For the matters in difference being acknowledged, by securing the Principle upon which they are to be decided; it will always be in their power to joyn for the maintenance of those Laws, whereby the Reformation is settled in their respective Sovereignties; without undertaking for the justice of any Laws, but those which each Sovereignty is to answer for, because it makes them. And the effect of this reservation will be



be of great consequence to the retaining of that Christianity which is left us. For this limitation will exclude all Power of joyning, for the maintenance of Subjects in attempting the Reformation of Religion, or the maintenance of the same by force, against the will of their Sovereigns. The oversight of which provision in actions of State, imputed to the suppression of Religion, when they might as well have been intitled to causes of Civil Right, hath had a very visible hand in the troubles which we have seen: And is the more carefully to be avoided for the future, because the pretense is, upon all occasions, so studiously advanced by those that have been active in the same.

*An instance in  
the having of  
Images in  
Churches.*

I have maintained the lawfulness of having Images in Churches. Now considering the distance between *lawful* and *necessary*, I find it not amiss to declare by this instance, upon what terms the Rule which I have proposed, of reducing all customs of this Church to that estate in which we find them practised, during the Primitive times of the Catholick Church, may be servicable to the purpose of Unity amongst our selves: For there is so little mention of Images in Churches, during near four hundred years after Christ, for increase of devotion, for instruction of the unlearned, or for the ornament of Churches; that it may well be demanded, as for the consequence of that Rule, that the use of them, though lawful, may be surceased in Churches. And accordingly I do acknowledge, that comparing the benefit reasonably to be expected from the use of them, with the abuse to which experience hath discovered them to be subject; I see no cause why the use of them might not be forborn, upon such a reason as might be effectual to unite us in a Rule bounding the Reformation which we profess, upon the ground of the common Christianity in all particulars. The reason is, because the having of them is not a necessary mean to that instruction or devotion, which is proposed for the end of them; and on the other side, is acknowledged by all the Reformation to have been the occasion of abuse, the preventing whereof will require that care and diligence which the forbearing of them will spare. But seeing it hath appeared no breach upon Christianity to have them in Churches; and that the abuse which may reasonably be apprehended by having them to the purposes specified, is of no consequence

quence, in comparison with that benefit which the Unity of the Church procureth; it will never be lawful to enjoin this forbearance, without declaring, that it signifieth not that they are held *unlawful*: or that we hold our selves bound to depart from Unity with the Church, rather than endure them. For seeing the *Lutherans* do use them in a great measure, for the reasons specified; if the uniting of us with the rest of the Reformation, upon the due ground and terms hitherto required, should depend upon a reasonable compliance in that particular; it is manifest, that it would be a sufficient reason to oblige us to the same. And therefore much more, if a general re-union with the Church of *Rome* should come to depend upon such a compliance. The consequence of this instance may be the means to inform those that are capable, what the reason of Unity may oblige us to abate of that which we take to be for the best, in matters of less consequence; that the unvaluable benefit of it may be obtained in this estate, when the protection of Sovereign Powers renders the Unity of the Church so necessary, so effectual to the salvation of all. For on the other side, the interruption of it is that which renders that same salvation questionable; by the difficulty which it createth, of observing the duty of a Christian as a Christian; by the impossibility rather than the difficulty, which it procureth of observing the duty of a Christian as a Member of the Church, which the breach of Unity alloweth not due conduct to understand.

To fortifie the necessity of the Proposition that I make, I will here propose an Objection in behalf of the Church of *Rome*, against the validity of our Ordinations; which I have always taken to have weight and difficulty in it, though others do not seem to value it. For the answering of this Objection will help to justify the Offence to be taken, and not given, that may come by the liberty which here I use. The succession of our Bishops deriveth it self by Ordination of three Bishops, which the Canon of the Apostles authorizeth; but the Canon of *Nicea* requireth farther the consent of the Bishops of each Province. Whereby it appeareth, that Ordination by two or three Bishops is allowed by the Canon of the Apostles, upon presumption, that the Suffragants of each Pro-

*An Objection  
for the Church  
of Rome answered.*

vince concur in allowing the Act of their fellows. Which presumption ceaseth in our case; because it is manifest, that the greatest part of the Suffragans did not consent to the Consecration of our Bishops, but declared against it; being therefore displaced by the Power of the Sword, deciding for the lesser part against the greater, which the Rule of the Church enableth not to do. Whereupon it is argued, that the Secular Power was not able to authorize our Reformation, as Patron of the Church, and the Canons of it. To fortifie the Objection, I alledge the case of *Novatianus*, who was consecrated Bishop of *Rome* by three Bishops; and yet his Consecration was Schismatical, because against *Cornelius*, Consecrated by sixteen. So the Ordination of *Majorinus*, that was first consecrated Bishop of *Carthage* against *Cacilianus*, for a head to the Schism of the Donatists, was justly counted Schismatical, though it was made by a number more than sufficient of Bishops duly Ordained. Which I doubt not, may be found in other Schisms. I Answer, That the *Novatians* had nothing to charge the Church with, but the re-admitting of those that had fallen away in time of Persecution, upon Penance. The *Donatists* nothing, but that they who had Ordained *Cacilianus* were Apostates; though they were proved to be otherwise by several trials, which they would never rest satisfied with. As for all the rest, though both Sects followed the Faith and the Orders of the Catholick Church, yet they both re-baptized all those whom they reduced to themselves from the Communion of it, as counting all the Church Apostates for communicating with those whom they counted Apostates. Is this our case? Do we find no fault with the Doctrine, or with the Laws of the Church of *Rome*; wherein Sovereigns might find themselves bound to right both themselves and their Subjects, notwithstanding the dissent of the Church of *Rome*? For though the Rule of Succession by Ordination of Bishops, bear them not out in it; though the Unity of the Church regularly depend upon the force of that Rule; yet seeing the Unity of the Church fails of the end for which God ordaineth it, unless it preserve the Christianity which it supposeth entire, as well in the publick service of God, as in the profession and conversation of Christians; it ought not to be taken for a departure from  
that

that Unity, that is restored without that Authority which regularly is provided to preserve it. For the consent of all other Estates of the Kingdom, in that ground, and upon those terms, which are to take place before the authority of those that dissent, will abundantly justify the validity of those Ordinations which declare an intent of ministring the Office, according to the due ground and terms which they suppose. And therefore it will not be so visible, when that ground and those terms are not so visible. And upon these terms are the Christian people of this Kingdom bound to own and to authorize them in their Orders, notwithstanding that the greater part of the Suffragans refused them their concurrence to the same. And if the change that is made be such in matters of greatest weight, the case will be the same, though it fail of the Rule in some matters of less consequence.

And upon these terms I admit the plea of the Reformation, That succession of Doctrine is of more consequence than succession of Persons. Not allowing their mistake, in thinking the Order of Bishops the supporters of Antichrist: For it is evident to him that will use his five senses, that the greatness of the Pope, for which they will have him to be Antichrist, stands as well by Usurping upon the Bishops, as upon the Crown. And therefore it was a spice of madness in our Puritans to proceed upon their example to Ordination, without and against their Bishops, either by Presbyters, or by Congregations. Whereas they who could not obtain Ordination from Bishops, because they professed the Reformation, might more justly think themselves tyed to proceed, neglecting that which they could not have; but trusting in the mercy of God, that seeing the abuses of the Church were gross, and visible, and palpable; the zeal of Gods House which carried men to Reform them, before they were agreed upon all that was to be restored instead of them, renders the Reformation, imperfect as it is, effectual to salvation, notwithstanding that they may have failed in matters of less consequence. Especially considering, that particular Christians, who are not able to judge of the publick concerns of the Church, may be able to see the abuses thereof, and to reform their own lives and conversations by that conduct, which an imperfect Reformation may furnish. Not doubting in the

*That which excludes the Reformed Churches, extendeth not to our Schismatics.*

mean time, that this imperfection is the loss of an innumerable number of Souls, as well as the abuses of the Church of *Rome* are. And therefore thinking my self tied to say so, that all publick Persons of what quality soever, in Church or Commonwealth in all the severall quarters of Christendom, may be stirred up to consider, how much it concerns their discharge at the Day of Judgment, that the Reformation be reduced to that Rule, and that measure in every point, which the ground and reason of Reformation evidenceth. For then shall we not need to apprehend any nullity upon unavoidable neglect of Canonical proceeding; when the restoring of Christianity, which all Canons presuppose and tend to maintain, justifieth the defect of it in one, for obtaining the end of it in all acts of the Church. And this would be the best ground for hope, if yet there be any hope left to propagate it through all Christendom, by the consent of the See of *Rome*, to the re-uniting of the Church upon such terms as that ground and reason requireth.

**The**

## The Printer to the Reader.

**I**T is thought fit to reprint herewith two short Discourses of the same Author, to the same purpose. The one, concerning the Establishment pretended by the late Usurpation, that he might not seem now to disown it; though using it with that liberty which all men use in new Editions of their own Writings. The other, because it toucheth more briefly some of those Heads, which are more perfectly, though Summarily, comprized in the Premisses; being published to that purpose, upon His Majesties happy Return, in July 1660.

A





*A LETTER concerning the present  
State of Religion amongst us,*

*Under the Act of Establishment, prosecuted  
by the Ordinances constituting the Triers and  
Commissioners for ejecting of Scandalous  
Ministers.*

S-I R,

**I** Have perused the Ordinance for *ejecting of Scandalous Ministers*: and finding it likely enough to send you a Pastor, that shall have no Authority from the Church, have thought it necessary for me to give you the Reasons of that Opinion which I declared unto you; that in that case you ought not in conscience to acknowledge such a one for your Pastor by going to hear him preach, and seeming to joyn in his Prayers; much less to receive the Eucharist at his hands, if such a one shall be so audacious as to celebrate it.

This that I may do, I must first propose the Case as it is stated by those Acts which pretend to settle Religion among us. For first, the Act whereby the present Government is established, declareth, that the *Christian Religion contained in the Scriptures shall be held forth, as the publick Profession of these Nations*; and that *such as profess Faith in God by Jesus Christ*, though differing from this Profession in Doctrine, Worship or Discipline, shall be protected in the exercise of their Religion; excepting Popery and Prelacy, and those who under the profession of Christ, hold forth and practice licentiousness. In prosecution hereof an Ordinance is issued forth, giving commission to certain persons named in it, to examine and try all that have come into possession of Churches since *April 13. 1653.* all that have Augmentations from Parliament: all that shall pretend to

to come into Churches that shall be void. But they are to try them by no other Rule than the Certificate of three *godly Neighbours*, (one at least a *Minister*) concerning their conversation in godliness upon their own knowledge: and the Judgment of five Commissioners, that the Grace of God is in their hearts, and that they are fit to preach. In further prosecution hereof issues forth this Ordinance, whereby no man is made scandalous for his Judgment, but he that is liable to the Act against Blasphemy of *August 9. 1653.* And with him is ranked he, who shall frequently and publickly have used the Service since *Christmas 1653.* Whereby it appeareth, that those who have declared their perseverance in the Religion which they have hitherto professed, by reading the Service, are therefore counted scandalous; but those that can pass the trial proposed, are thereby qualified in Law to be Pastors of Parishes: And consequently, to succeed those that adhere to the Christianity which hitherto they have professed, being cast out by the Commissioners for *ejecting of scandalous Ministers.*

In the first place then I say, that the effect of these Laws is to nullifie and make void one Article of the Creed, which hitherto we profess; to wit, the belief of *one holy Catholick and Apostolick Church.* This word *Church* may signifie two things: First, only the whole number of Christians; Secondly, a *Communion* and *Corporation* of those that profess *true Christianity*, founded by the will of God, and the ministry of our Lord Christ and his Apostles. That Christians, when they profess to believe *the Catholick Church*, do not mean the first sense, That there is in the World a number of men that profess to be Christians, it is manifest, because all Christians hope to be saved by their Faith; but they cannot hope to be saved by believing that which they see. Now all men see that there is such a company of men in the World. Therefore when they say, they believe *the Catholick Church*, as part of that Faith whereby they hope to be saved, they do not profess to believe that there is such a company of men; but that there is a Corporation of true Christians, excluding Hereticks and Schismatics: and that they hope to be saved by this Faith, as being members of it. And this is that which the style of the *holy Catholick and Apostolick Church* signifies, as distinguishing the Body of  
true

true Christians, (to wit, so far as profession goes) from the Conventicles of Hereticks and Schismatics. For this title of *Catholick* would signifie nothing, if Hereticks and Schismatics were not barred the Communion of the Church. And let no man imagine, that the Schism, which the Reformation hath made between us and the Church of *Rome*, hath dissolved the obligation of being members of the Church. If that change which is called *Reformation*, preserve not such a Church, as ought to be acknowledged for a true member of the whole (or *Catholick*) Church; it is no Reformation, but the destruction of Christianity. Now when these Laws enable Soul-diers, and Justices of the peace, as well as those that call themselves Ministers, to make publick Preachers; as well such as have received no Ordination from the Church, as those that have: It is manifest that all difference between Clergy and People, is by them dissolved, and made void: And by consequence, the Corporation of the Church; which grounds and creates all the difference, which hitherto by all Christians hath been received, between those two qualities. True it is, that for the present as well those who have lawful authority to officiate the publick Service of God, by Ordination from the Church, are admitted to, or maintained in their Benefices, by these Laws, as those that have none: Though it be well enough known, that those who have such authority, do pretend to act by virtue of it, and not by this Law; further then, as by submitting to it, they remove that force, which hinders their right, otherwise gotten, to take effect. But it is as true, that supposing this Law to continue an Age, none such can remain. And when none such remains, then there shall be no Church in *England*, but by equivocation of words; if the premises be true. And therefore, those that acknowledg such as have no other authority but from this power, for their Pastors; cannot consequently profess to believe one *Catholick Church*, nor hope for salvation by being Members of it. For supposing for the present, though not granting, that the power which makes these Laws is from God; yet can it not be pretended to be from our Lord Christ and his Apostles. And therefore, this authority derived from it, cannot be derived from any act of theirs, constituting the Church, and enabling it to give this authority, by ac-

knowledging whereof, Christians presume that they are members of the Church.

Now that you may see, why the belief of Christs Church is an Article of our Creed; I say further, that you cannot acknowledge such men for your Pastors, because you are not secured by these Laws, that they are not Hereticks. For seeing the Act of Establishment pretends only to *hold forth the Christian Religion contained in the Scriptures*; and that all the Heresies that are this day in the world do maintain themselves to profess the Christian Religion contained in the Scriptures; it is manifest, that these Laws provide not, that they shall not be Hereticks, which are sent you for Pastors. Here I must not complain, that whereas all that profess *Faith in God by Jesus Christ*, though differing from the profession held forth, are protected in the exercise of their Religion, Popery and Prelacy are excepted; though it cannot be denied, that both profess *Faith in God by Jesus Christ*. Nor that those, who hold that profession established by the Laws under which we were born, are refused that protection, which is tendred Socinians, enemies of the Trinity and Satisfaction of Christ; who manifestly profess *Christian Religion contained in the Scriptures*, and *Faith in God by Jesus Christ*. For my business is not to say, what they that made these Laws should have done, instead of making them; but what you are to do now they are made. But if it be answered that those that make these Laws, repose trust in them to whom they grant these Commissions, that they will not take any to be *godly men* that are Hereticks: To this I say, that will not serve your turn, for several reasons. For those that profess all that this Law requires them to profess; that is, *Faith in God through Jesus Christ*, and the *Christian Religion contained in the Scriptures*; cannot be judged ungodly for whatsoever they profess besides, by any power derived from this Law, but an arbitrary power, to be exercised at the will of the Commissioners. And how are you assured that no Heretick shall obtain a certificate of three Neighbours, and so answer their demands, that they shall think him in Gods Grace? However, you are not warranted to trust your Salvation, and the Salvation of those that depend on you, either upon the judgment of these Commissioners, or of them that make the Laws. If it be demanded,

demanded, why the Secular Power, and the Commissioners thereof are not as well to be trusted with the Salvation of the people, as those that may pretend authority from the Church? The answer is ready: that when you acknowledge a Pastor sent by the Church, you neither trust his person, not the person of him that sends him; but the Laws which the Church hath received from our Lord and his Apostles. For limiting his profession, and undertaking to exercise the function which he receiveth according to them, he becomes thereby qualified for his charge. But he who acknowledges no such Laws, because he acknowledges no Catholick Church, destroys the trust you are to have in those whom you acknowledge your Pastors, that they are not Hereticks.

And here I must not fail to give you notice, that those Presbyterians and Independents, who having departed from the Church of *England*, upon pretense of erecting Presbyteries and Congregations, do now make themselves Commissioners to execute those Laws, which destroy both Presbyteries and Congregations; have thereby destroyed the ground of all trust which the Church might have had in them, for conduct in Christianity. For what profession can it be presumed that they will stand to, when they stand not to that, for which they have destroyed the Unity of this Church? Which is the reason, why Hereticks and Schismatics, though they may be re-admitted to the Communion of the Church, upon repentance; yet by the Rules of the Catholick Church, cannot be re-admitted to be of the Clergy. For these Apostasies make them incapable of that trust, which the Church must necessarily repose in the Clergy.

That you may see this is not for nothing; I say further, that that there is among us a damnable Heresie of *Antinomians*, or Enthusiasts; formerly, when Puritans were not divided from the Church of *England*, known by the name of *Grindlers* and *Etonists*. These do believe so to be saved by the free Grace of God, by which Christ died for the Elect, that true faith is nothing but the revelation hereof: and by consequence, that all their sins, past, present, and to come, being remitted by this Grace; to repent of sin, or to contend against it, is the renouncing of Gods free Grace, and saving faith.



Another Opinion there is, which I cannot say the Presbyterians hold, or require to be held; but in regard their Confession of Faith, and Catechism disclaims it not, and therefore allows them that hold it to be of their Faction, may well be said to maintain it: That for a man to believe that he is predestinate to life, and that Christ died for him, is that Faith, which alone justifieth a Christian. Whether of these opinions is the better, or the worse; or what is the difference between them, let the parties dispute. This I say, that allowing the merits and satisfaction of Christ to the Elect for remission of sins, and a title to everlasting life, in no consideration, but of their persons; it is more reasonable to say, that they can never become guilty of sin, then that the remission of their sins, and their right to life, should depend upon the knowledge of their Predestination revealed by Faith. For nothing is true because it is believed, but believed because it is true. And therefore, I say, that both of these opinions are destructive to that foundation of Faith, which the Church of England teacheth; when in the Office of Baptism, and the beginning of the Catechism, it requireth all that are Baptized, not only to profess the Faith of Christ, *but to renounce the flesh, the world, and the devil, and to fight with them till death, for the keeping of Gods Commandments; assuring them hereupon, that they are regenerate, and adopted Gods Children by his Grace in Christ.* For he that is saved by undertaking and persevering in this, cannot be saved by believing, that he is absolutely predestinate to life without it. For I must say; that it is one thing to be absolutely predestinate to life; another thing to be predestinate to life, by being absolutely predestinate to persevere till death. For he that is predestinate to life, by being absolutely predestinate to persevere in the Covenant of Grace till death, is predestinate to life in consideration of the Covenant of Grace, in which he is predestinate to persevere. And whether a man can be absolutely predestinate to persevere in it, of his own free choice, or not; is that which remains in dispute among Divines, which I suppose not here, to be either true or false. But to say that a man is absolutely predestinate to life; and to say that he is predestinate to life, in consideration of the Covenant of Grace; which must be the Act of his own free choice,

choise; is to say expresse contradictions: And to say that a man is predestinate to life without consideration of the Covenant of Grace, is to destroy the Covenant of Grace, and the hope of salvation; which is meerly imaginary, if not grounded upon it. Seeing then, that the trial upon which these Commissioners proceeded, is, their marks of predestination, whether they be true or false; not supposing the Covenant of Grace, the undertaking of it, and persevering in it; I say, that you are no way secured by these Laws, that the Triers themselves, much less those whom they shall send you, are not complices of this damnable Heresie.

I must not forget to advise you, that *Dell*; one so far of this Heresie, that he is thought to have written the Book called the *Doctrine of Baptisms*, against Baptism it self; is now, and is acknowledged by these Commissioners, Master of a Colledge in the University; (whereof several Fellows have been notorious Preachers of this Heresie) who cannot be acknowledged a member of the Church by any good Christians.

The like I alledge in regard of the Sect of the Anabaptists. In which point, I must suppose two things. First, that the Christian Faith supposeth Original sin. Secondly, that without Baptism, there is no cure for it. And this depends upon the premises; that there is no absolute predestination, without consideration of the Covenant of Grace; which Baptism executing, cureth it. For whatsoever our Lord meant, when he said; *unless ye be born again of water* — it is manifest, that, though no man can become a true Christian without the operation of the Holy Ghost; yet the habitual gift and indowment of the Holy Ghost, dwelling in a man, is not granted, but in consideration of his entering into the said Covenant; and that this gift is the only cure of Original sin. There is then no necessity of shewing an expresse precept in Scripture, that all infants be baptized: or that the Church from the Apostles time did Baptize all, while they were Infants. If the Christian Faith suppose Original sin; if no cure for that, but by the Covenant of Grace; if no execution of that Covenant, but the Baptism of the Church; (unless, where the outward act is prevented by inevitable necessity, after the inward desire thereof was sufficiently resolved and declared) then is this necessity a constraining precept, and hath been so reputed by the Church,  
ever

ever since the Apostles; which always hath taken order; not that all should be baptized Infants, but that no Infant should die unbaptized. For the diligent watch over all occasions, that might carry Infants out of the World unbaptized, observed by the Church from the beginning, though neglected since; demonstrateth no legal assurance of the salvation of such as should die unbaptized: Whatsoever might be presumed of Gods goodness, over and above what he declareth. But as for those that shall become obliged and engaged to the Covenant of Grace, by being consecrated to God through the Act of the Church, thereby obliging it self to shew them the truth of Christianity, which obligeth all to whom it is shewed; the necessity aforesaid, together with the practice of the Church is a legal presumption of the cure of Original sin, and the opening of Paradise, which it only shutteth. If therefore our Anabaptists do not believe Original sin, they are Pelagian Hereticks. If believing it, they believe notwithstanding, that it is cured by Predestination, without the Covenant of Grace, they fall into the Heresie premised. And voiding the Baptism which they received of the Church, they seem to renounce the Christianity which it enacteth; but manifestly they render their own Baptism void of effect towards God. For they who rebaptize upon a ground, that allows Salvation by Gods Predestination revealed by Faith, without undertaking and persevering in the Covenant of Grace, cannot pretend to baptize into the Covenant of Grace; that is, into the profession of the true faith and of fighting against sin untill death, under the same. Seeing then, that the necessity of Baptism cannot be denied, but upon such a ground, as voideth the Covenant of Grace; and seeing the Triers are either Anabaptists themselves, or complices in the same Commission with Anabaptists; (whereof there are divers in these Commissions) it is evident, that by these Laws you are no way secured of having Anabaptists for your Pastors; who are expressly Schismaticks, (forsaking the Church for that which the Church always did,) and by consequence of the premised reasons, Hereticks.

As the Baptism of those men, whom they pretend to send you for Pastors, is by this reason, void of effect; So the Eucharist which they may pretend to celebrate, will be void of the

the effect of a Sacrament toward you, but not void of the crime of Sacriledge towards God. The reasons are two. The first, because those who have not received the Order of Priesthood shall pretend to celebrate it. For the Scripture, interpreted by the un-interrupted practice of the Church, allows no man under the Order of a Priest, to celebrate the Eucharist. Not as if those who call themselves *Ministers* did commit this Sacriledge, in consecrating the Eucharist. For though the name of *Ministers* signifies no more then *Deacons*; and that it is truly Sacriledge for *Deacons* to celebrate the Eucharist; Yet they whom they call *Ministers*, if Ordained, were Ordained Priests; with power to celebrate the Eucharist. For they call them *Ministers*, to impose upon the World an opinion, which they cannot prove by the Scripture; that they are the only *Ministers of the Word and Sacraments*. The second, because they know not, nor acknowledge, the Consecration, that is requisite to the celebration and being of this Sacrament, by the same Scriptures, understood according to the un-interrupted custom and practice of the Church. For the whole Church of God, allowing the Elements consecrated to be the Body and Blood of Christ mystically, or in the Sacrament; alloweth this change to be made by the consecration, before which they were only Bread and Wine. Not as if, after the Consecration, they were not so; but because they are in them become that which they were not afore; to wit, the *Sacrament of Christs Body and Blood*; or the Body and Blood of Christ *Spiritually*, and *Mystically*; that is, *in the Sacrament*. This Consecration being exactly maintained by the Church of *England*; they that presume to celebrate the Eucharist, without acknowledging the same; and pretending to destroy the Law by which it is exercised; must be presumed, not to acknowledge the necessity thereof, to the being of this Sacrament: And therefore, they and their complices in the Communion thereof, to be guilty of the Body and Blood of Christ; as not distinguishing a sign of mans institution, from a Sacrament of Gods appointment and Ordinance.

As for the Office of Preaching and praying, which they pretend to, in behalf of the Church; I will mark you out two monstrous Impostures, in all the Sects of this time. The first

is

is this ground of the now pretended Reformation of Religion in *England*; That the Church is not to assemble for the Service of God, but when there is Preaching. This seems to stand upon a very gross mistake of those passages of the Apostles writings which declare the necessary means of salvation to consist, in hearing the Gospel preached: As if they were meant of Sermons in the Pulpit, which are only made to those that are already Christians; not of publishing the Gospel to those that knew it not afore, convincing them that it is true, and instructing them wherein it consists. Or as if those that are already Christians wanted any thing necessary to Salvation; supposing them to persevere in the Christianity which they have professed. Not as if their Christianity did not oblige them to hear Sermons, when the authority of the Church assures them to be without offense; But because the Offices of publick Prayers, and the Praises of God, especially in celebrating the blessed Eucharist, are the end of all that instruction in Christianity, which Christians receive from the Church; and therefore, all Preaching subordinate to the same, as the means to the end. And because they may be daily so frequented, without offense, and to the increase of the reverence due to Christianity; as the experienced of our time shows, that Preaching cannot be.

The second is, that the first day of the week, called Sunday, is the Sabbath, by force of the fourth Commandment. A mistake so gross, that it may well serve for an instance, what Faction can do, with men that are sober otherwise. That God by commanding the Jews to keep the seventh day of the week; to wit, that day on which he ended the Creation of the world, and for that very reason commanding it, should be thought to command Christians to keep the first day of the week, on which he began the Creation, and our Lord Christ arose from the dead: That is, that the same words of the same Commandment in writing, should oblige Jews to rest on the Saturday, which oblige Christians to rest on the Sunday; is a thing which when this fit of frenzies shall be past us, will scarce be believed, that ever any man would believe. True it is, this first day hath been observed, in and ever since the Apostles time; but not by virtue of that Law, which their Office was to declare expired, and out of date; but by the Act of their own



own authority, whereby they gave Laws to Christs Church.

Let us now only compare the daily morning and evening sacrifice of Prayer and the Praises of God, established by the Order of the Church of *England*, together with the more solemn service of Lords-days and Festivals; with a bare Sermon upon Sundays, usher'd in and out with a Prayer of every mans own conceit; (setting aside the Heresie and Falle Doctrine, the Faction and Schism, the Blasphemy and Slander, the ridiculous Follies which this Sermon and Prayer may, and which we have known them contain) I say, comparing these together, the Reformation pretended, is, and ought to be accounted, *the abomination of desolation* in comparison of that Order which it destroyeth. And therefore upon this account alone, those who not being invested with that ordinary Power by which the Church is enabled to correct abuses in the Church, shall usurp the Power of the Church to introduce this disorder, are thereby Schismaticks themselves; and those that acknowledge them for their Pastours, complices of Schismaticks.

It will be said, that these Laws will be amended; as it was many times said a while since, that *the Parliament would seile a Ministry*. To thi I say, that those who shall be sent you by virtue of these Laws, have every way as good authority, as any the Power that made these Laws, joyned with a Parliament, can give to them, that are not otherwise qualified by the authority of the Church: that is, that this Power, and the Power of a Parliament together, though advising with Divines, can do no more than this Power, with advice of those Divines which it useth, hath done. Because both are Secular, and able to make men *their Ministers*, to maintain the Interest of that Government which their Power constituteth; but not *Ministers of the Church*, to maintain the Interest of that Faith and Service of God, which it is trusted with. If it be said, That in most parts of the Reformation, those from whom the Ministry is propagated, had not received, by their Ordination, Power to ordain others. For answer, I suppose, That the abuses crept into the Church were so great, that particular Churches, that is, part of the whole, might, and ought to reform themselves, without consent or concurrence of the whole. I suppose, that though there be in the Church a succession of Persons endued



with authority in behalf of it ; as well as of Faith, and of Rules or Laws ; yet the succession of persons is of less consideration, being subordinate to the succession of Faith and Laws , as the means to the end. And then I say, that supposing a necessity of Ordaining, because they who refused the Reformation would not Ordain to that purpose ; and supposing the Reformation to be that which God requireth, there is cause to presume, that the intent, which those that agree in it declare, supplies by Gods goodness that nullity, which the want of Power to Ordain would otherwise infer. For those mistakes of less consequence, which humane weakness must needs commit in a work of such weight ; as if it were malice in man to justify, so it may well be thought mercy in God to excuse. This presumption there is, that the Churches thus constituted are true Churches ; and the Offices ministred by persons thus qualified, effectual to convey the Grace of God to Christian People. But we suppose in our case, that Presbyterian Ordinations tend no more to the exercise of true Christianity, than of that which the Church of *England* hitherto professeth. And we see with our eyes, that the authority that maketh them destroyeth it self, by destroying the authority of their Bishops from whom it claimeth. And therefore to imagine, that an Assembly of Divines, by being lawfully Ordained to the office of Priests or Deacons, according to the Laws of the Church of *England*, can by Commission from the Secular Power make Ordinations, which the Laws under which they were Ordained forbid ; is to imagine, that God can enable man to sin ; or, that a Sovereign Power can authorize the Subject to rebel against it self. And therefore though the qualities of persons to be sent you for Pastors, may be otherwise limited by Acts which Parliaments may make, yet these qualities, (not being derived from the authority of the Apostles founding the Church by any act of the Church ; but from Secular Power, and Commission issued from it) make them no more Ministers of the Church, that are made by Assemblies of Divines and Presbyteries ; than those that are made by Commission of *Triers*, and for ejecting scandalous Ministers. That is, both of them being by their creation Schismatics, and their Profession not clearing them of misprision of Heresie, they can no more be acknowledged by those that pretend

tend to adhere to the Church of *England*, than Belial by Christ, or darkness by light.

Hereby then you may conclude, how to receive those whom the Presbyterians may send you for Pastors, by any change in the Secular Power. For I charge not them, that they do not believe the Church, which they would be themselves. I acknowledge that they secure you from all Sects but themselves. But in as much as they maintain Predestination to life, only in consideration of what Christ hath already done or suffered for the Elect; insomuch I say, that they do not, nor can Baptize into the Cross of Christ; that is to say, into the hope of Salvation, in consideration of the Covenant of Baptism. For that which is absolutely due, as salvation is due to the Elect by the gift of Gods Predestination, cannot be burthened with any condition of Christianity afterwards. Nor can he who is once sure to be saved, without that condition which Baptism enacteth, be bound to *fight against the flesh, the World and the Devil, for the keeping of Gods Commandments, under the Profession of the Christian Faith*, for the obtaining of that which he is sure of before. And therefore their Baptism is no effectual Baptism before God, if Baptism received into the Church of *England* be such; (that is to say, it is no Baptism, but by Equivocation of words) in as much as the obligation of a mans Christianity is not declared or understood, to take hold of him by virtue of it. For seeing the hope of salvation, which Christians have by their Baptism, is grounded upon the condition of their Christianity; that Baptism which promiseth salvation, without providing for this condition, is no Baptism, but by equivocation of words.

I say further, that the change which they call Reformation, visibly tends to introduce that *monstrous imposture* of two Sermons every *Sabbath*, instead of the daily and ordinary service of God, together with the more solemn service of God upon Festivals and Lords-days, and other extraordinary occasions, which the Church of *England*, (with the whole Church of God from the beginning) hath maintained, so far as there was means to maintain it. I will not here insist upon the Order of Bishops, and their chief Power in their Dioceses, as of Divine Right; that is, instituted and introduced by the Apostles. Let the Presbyterians think

themselves priviledged to erect Altar against Altar, upon so desperate a Plea as now they insist upon, that the Presbyteries are *rather of Divine right*, than the chief Power of Bishops in their Dioceses; I insist now only, that this Power of the Bishops was not against Gods Law, which every man must grant me, that acknowledges a Church in *England* from the Reformation till now. In this case they, who to introduce this Christianity, and this publick exercise of it, transgressing that authority to which they were called by the visible act of the Church of *England*, take upon them to share that Power from which they had their authority among themselves, and to execute it by consent among themselves in their several precincts, cannot be said to constitute a Church by virtue of any act of the Apostles, or any authority derived from such act; but by virtue of their own act, as all Apostates and Usurpers do. That is to say, that they do not constitute such a Church, by being a Member whereof a man may reasonably assure himself of salvation, upon any principle of Christianity; but such a Church as is indeed no Church, unless it be by Equivocation of terms; but a conventicle of Schismatics, with the misprision of the Heresie aforesaid. And therefore their Priesthood is no Priesthood, their Eucharist is no Eucharist, (unless it be by equivocation of words) but Sacrilege against Gods Ordinance. Besides that what is requisite to the consecration of the Eucharist, or wherein it consists, they seem to be as secure of, and as little to regard, as the most ignorant of those Sects, into which the one common name of Puritans stands divided at this time. Neither is it in any Secular Power, though never so unquestionable, to cure these nullities and incapacities in the pretense, upon which they take upon them to be a Church. Though for the present they are not so much as authorized to the world, by any priviledge or penalty enacted by any Secular Power; but only protected by that which now possesseth. Whereby the World may see, that there is nothing but their own usurpation, and the consent of those whom they have debauched to their Schism, for them to subsist by under the pretense of a Church. And that they will, by virtue of their Original, be as malignant to any Secular Power, that shall not maintain and authorize them, as ever they were to that which they destroyed, to introduce this shadow of a Church.

If

If it be objected, that your Estates will be liable to penalties, that may be enacted against those that withdraw from the exercise of the Religion publicly held forth? To this I have no answer, but that we are to obey God rather than man; to prefer the next world before this; and to bear Christs Cross, if we expect his Kingdom. Only thus much I must observe, that these Laws proceed from a Profession, that it is not lawful to force mens Consciences in matter of Religion by Penalties. And therefore though the Prelatical party are not protected in the exercise of their Religion; yet cannot they be punished for it, but by denying that which is declared upon the publick Faith. Besides acknowledging *the Christian Religion contained in the Scriptures*, and *professing Faith in God by Jesus Christ*, they are as much qualified for protection, as those that are protected by the Act of Establishment. And not to allow the exercise of that Religion, the Profession whereof is not disallowed, seems to be to forbid men to be Christians, who are not forbidden to be such Christians; and to expose them to popular tumult, (contrary to the publick Peace) whom no Law punishes. If the Papists continue nevertheless liable to former penalties, perhaps it is because they are reputed Idolaters. But because these Laws, and the profession from whence they proceed, may change; I must confess, you cannot follow my advice, but that your estate may become questionable: neither would I give it, could I assure you of the Kingdom of heaven otherwise.

If you demand, what means I can shew you to exercise your Religion, withdrawing from the means which these Acts provide? I answer, that there are hitherto every where of the Clergy that adhere to the Church; who will find it their duty to see your Infants Christned, your Children Catechized, the Eucharist communicated to all, that shall withdraw from Churches forcibly possessed by them whom you own not for Pastors. And if they cannot continually minister to you, so dispersed, the ordinary Offices of Gods Service, you have the Service of God according to the Order of the Church; you have the Scriptures to read for part of it; you have store of Sermons manifestly allowed by the Church to read; you have Prayers prescribed for all your own necessities, and the necessities

ties of the Church. To serve God with these in private, with such as depend upon you, and are of the same Judgment with you, (leaving out what belongs to the Priests Office to say) I do to the best of my Judgment, believe an acceptable sacrifice to God; which you cannot offer at the Church in such case. And though I censure not my Brethren of the Clergy, that think fit to comply with the Power which we are under, in holding or coming by their Benefices; (I suppose in respect to their Flocks, rather than to their Fruits) yet if they believe themselves and their flocks to be the Members of the Church of *England*, they must needs believe those flocks that acknowledge such Pastors to be Members of no Church; and therefore acknowledge you, and own your departure, and declare themselves to their own flocks, and instruct them to do the like, when the like case falls out: And so the refusing to hear the voice of Strangers, will unite us to make a flock under those whom we acknowledge our lawful Pastors.

I have found my self pressed to print Copies hereof for my own use, thereby to declare thus much of my Judgment to you, and to the rest of my Friends; because the consequence of owning such men for your Pastours, will be to make us Members of several Churches. Which must disable me to do any office of a Clergy-man towards you; unless it be the prosecuting of this, by shewing you further reasons to justify what I say here, and to reduce you to it. Though it shall always be my study faithfully to serve my Friends, in all Offices of civility. And I hope they will consider, what appearance there is, that any thing should move me to make my self liable to so much harm as the publick declaring of this Opinion will make me liable to; but the discharge of my conscience to God and them, as the case shall require me to discharge it.

*The*



*The due Way of composing the difference  
on Foot, preserving the Church;  
According to the Opinion of*  
HERBERT THORNDIKE.

**I** Have found my self obliged, by that horrible confusion in Religion which the late War hath introduced, to declare the utmost of mine Opinion concerning the whole point of Religion, upon which the Western Church stands divided into so many parties. And now, finding no cause to repent me of doing it, can find no cause why I should not declare the consequence of it, in settling of that which remains of our differences. For middle ways to so good an end, are now acceptable meerly as middle ways, and tending to drive a bargain, without pretending that they ought to be admitted. How much more an expedient pretending necessity, from reasons extant in publick, and not contradicted?

The chief ground that I suppose here, because I have proved it at large, is the meaning of that Article of our Creed, which professeth *one Catholick Church*. For either it signifies nothing, or it signifies, that God hath founded one *Visible Church*; that is, that he hath obliged all Churches, (and all Christians, of whom all Churches consist) to hold visible communion with the *Whole Church*, in the visible offices of Gods publick Service. And therefore I am satisfied, that the differences upon which we are divided cannot be justly settled upon any terms, which any part of the *Whole Church* shall have just cause to refuse, as inconsistent with the unity of the *Whole Church*. For in that case, we must needs become Schismatics, by settling our selves upon such Laws, under which any Church may refuse to communicate with us, because it is bound to communicate with the *Whole Church*. True it is, that the foundation of the Church, upon these terms, will presuppose the entire profession of Christianity, whether concerning Faith or Manners. For otherwise, how should those Offices in which all the Church is to

com-



municate, be counted the service of God according to Christianity? And this profession is the condition, upon the undergoing whereof all men, by being baptized and made Christians, are also admitted to communion with the Church, as Members of it.

But nothing can make it visible to the common reason of all men, what communion they are to resort unto for their Salvation, but the visible Communion of all parts of the Church; which having been maintained for divers Ages of the Church, is now visibly interrupted by the Reformation, and before by the breach between the Greek and Latin Church. And therefore though it be visible to reason rightly informed, what communion a man is to embrace for his Salvation; yet it is not now visible to the common reason of all men that seek it. If this be true, then no power of the Church can extend so far, as to make any thing a part of the common Christianity, which was not so from the beginning; but it must needs extend so far, as to limit and determine all matters in difference, so as the preservation of Unity may require. And therefore the Unity of all parts supposing the profession of Christianity whole and intire; we shall justly be chargeable with the crime of *Heresie*, if we admit them to our communion, who openly disclaim the Faith of the whole Church, or any part of it. For those are justly counted Hereticks, as to the Church, by the Canons of the Church, that communicate with those who profess *Heresie*; though no Hereticks as to God, not believing it themselves. But the Unity of all parts being subordinate, and of inferiour consideration to the Unity of the Whole; we shall justly be chargeable with the crime of *Schism*, if we seek Unity within our selves by abrogating the Laws of the Whole, as not obliged to hold communion with it.

I confess I am convicted, that, as things stands, we are not to expect any reason from the Church of *Rome*, and those who hold communion with it, in restoring the Unity of the Church upon such Laws, as shall render the means of Salvation visible to all that use them as they ought. And this, and only this I hold to be the due ground, upon which we are enabled to provide an establishment of Unity in Religion among our selves, (as heretofore a Reformation in Religion for our selves) without

out concurrence of the Whole. But if we should think our selves at large, to conclude our selves without respect to the Faith and Laws of the whole Church, we may easily bring upon our selves a just imputation of Hereticks, for communicating with Hereticks; but a juster of Schismatics, if we abrogate the Laws of the whole Church, to obtain Unity among our selves; as declaring thereby, that we are not content to hold Unity with the Whole, unless a part may give Law to the Whole. So far am I from that madness, which hath had a hand in all our miseries; of thinking the right measure of Reformation to stand in going as far as it is possible from the Church of *Rome*. For were it evidenced, (as it neither is, nor ever will be evidenced,) that the *Pope* is Antichrist, and all Papists, by their profession, Idolaters; yet must we either raze the Article of *one Catholick Church* out of our Creed; or confess, that the *Pope* can neither be Antichrist, nor the Papists Idolaters, for or by any thing which is common to them with the Whole Church.

I know some will think it strange, that the *Pope* should excommunicate us on *Maundy-Thursdays*; that we should swear in the Oath of Supremacy, that no forreign Prelate hath, or ought to have, any Jurisdiction, or Authority Ecclesiastical in this Kingdom; and yet we be subject to do such Acts, for which the Church of *Rome* may justly renounce communion with us. But the word *ought* in that Oath is Indicative, and not Potential; not *deberet*, but *debet*. For it were a contradiction for the Church of *England*, to pray for the *Catholick Church*, and the Unity thereof, and yet renounce the Jurisdiction of the whole Church, and the general Council thereof, over it self. King *James* of excellent memory, acknowledgeth the *Pope* to be Patriarch of the *West*; that is, Head of the general Council of the Western Churches. And the right R. Father in God, *Thomas L. B. of Winchester* under *Q. Elizabeth*, in his answer to the Seminaries Apology, being demanded why we own him not so in effect; answereth bluntly, but truly, because he is not content with the right of a Patriarch. For should he disclaim the pretence of dissolving the bond of Allegiance, should he retire to the priviledge of a Patriarch, in seeing the Canons executed; the Schism would lie at our door, if we

G g

should

should refuse it. Now if they curse us, while we pray for the Unity of the whole Church, is it not the case of the Catholicks with the Donatists? For these rebaptized them whom those had baptized, whited over the inside of their Churches when they became possessed of them, scraped over their Altars, (being Tables of wood) in detestation of them, as Apostates and persecutors; while the Catholicks called them *Brethren*, and acknowledged them rightly baptized, and received them that were converted from that Schism in their respective Orders. The Unity of the Church is of such consequence to the salvation of all Christians, that no excess on one side can cause the other to increase the distance, but they shall be answerable for the Souls that perish by the means of it.

And therefore, not departing from the opinion which I have declared, concerning the terms upon which all parties ought to reconcile themselves, untill I shall have reason shewed me, why I should do it; I shall now go no further, then the matters that are actually questioned among us; not extending my discourse to points, that may perhaps more justly become questionable than some of those which have come in dispute. Professing in the beginning, that I believe they may and ought to be settled by a Law of the Kingdom, obliging all parties beside Recusants. But that the matter of that Law ought to be limited by the consent and authority of the Church, respective to this Kingdom. And withal, that I think it ought to be held, and shall for mine own part hold it an act meerly *ambulatory*, and *provisional* for the time. For though there is no hope of reconciliation with the Church of *Rome*, as things are; yet is there infinite reason for all sides, to abate of their particular pretensions, for the recovering so incomparable a benefit as the Unity of the Whole: If ever it shall please God to make the parties appear disposed to it.

Now the Errors which we are to shut out, if we will recover the Unity of a Visible Church, (that is, of Gods Whole Church) are two, in my judgment. First, though some things have been disputed in other parts, from whence the same consequence may be inferred: yet *England* is the place, and ours the times, which first openly and downright have maintained, that there is no such thing as a Church, in the nature of *any visible*  
Com-

*Communion*, founded by God. But it is maintained by several parties among us, upon several grounds. For some do not or will not understand, that there can be any Ecclesiastical power fouded by that act of God which foundeth Christianity, where there is secular power, founded also by those acts of God, whereby he authorizeth and inforceeth all just Sovereignities. Though all times, all parts, all Nations of Christendom since *Constantine*, profess to maintain the Church in that power, in which they found it acknowledged by Christians, when he first undertook to maintain that Christianity which he professed; all this must be taken, either for meer hypocrisie, or meer nonsense. Others there are, that do not think themselves obliged to the unity of Gods Church, upon far different Principles. There are of our *Enthusiasts*, such as are themselves every one a Church to themselves, and by themselves; as being above Ordinances, and the Communion of the Church provided only for proficients, But all Independent Congregations make the same profession, and are manifestly grounded upon the same. For how can they imagine themselves members of *one visible Church*, who profess that they cannot be obliged to hold Communion with any Congregation but their own?

And yet with favour, the same consequence insuing upon so different pretences, there must be some supposition common to both, upon which both do ground themselves. And it is easily visible what that is. Both opinions must suppose, that a man may be heir to Christs Kingdom, and indowed with Gods Spirit, without being, or before he be a member of Gods Church. And the Independents indeed do manifestly profess, that knowing themselves and others to be Gods Children, and indowed with his Spirit; they are in a capacity to joyn in Ecclesiastical Communion, with those whom they know to be such. So they become members of a Church, being Gods children before, without considering how they shall be members of the Whole Church. The others are satisfied, that by being members of a State which professeth Christianity, they are also members of that *one Holy Catholick and Apostolick Church*, which by our Creed we profess to believe. A ground which holdeth accidentally, so long as that State constituteth a visible member of the Whole, or the Catholick Church.

But not imaginable to serve the turn, when States differ in point of Christianity, and may every day appeal to force, whether is the true Church and whether the false.

For is it not manifest, that the professions of the *Lutherans*, the *Calvinists*, the *Greeks*, the *Abyssines*, are protected by Sovereign powers, as well as the profession of the Church of *Rome*, or the Church of *England*? Is it not manifest, that the powers that profess them; maintain them respectively to be Gods truth? Why then do we dispute any longer, which is the true Religion and which is the false, if it be enough for Christians to resolve all the doubt they can have concerning Religion, into the command of their Sovereigns, only professing Christianity? It is not manifest that Sovereigns do use to punish their Subjects, that conform not to their Laws concerning Religion, but follow that Religion which is in force under other Sovereignties? Is it possible to imagine, that Subjects can be obliged, by one and the same will of God, to follow contrary Religions under several Sovereigns? Or that Sovereigns can be inabled, by one and the same Law of God, to punish their Subjects, for serving God according to contrary professions? True it is, Subjects that suffer in a good cause shall be gainers thereby; gaining Heaven by their losses of this World. But what shall become of the Sovereigns that persecute them, being in a good cause? Or how shall not some of them be persecuted in a good cause, who are persecuted in contrary causes? I know not whether this peremptory difficulty was the cause: But I am sure recourse hath been had to a more desperate answer; that every Subject is bound to profess the Religion of his Sovereign; yea, though it injoyn him to renounce Christ with his mouth; remaining bound all the while to believe in him with his heart; and that by this belief, he shall be saved as a Christian. Neither is this position tenable but upon this answer; nor doth this answer import any less, then the utter renouncing of Christianity. I know, that in the Records of the Antient Church, those who only professed to believe Christianity, (who were called *Catechumeni*, or *Scholars to the Church*) are sometimes called by the name of *Christians*. But I know withall, that they were never counted in the state of Salvation, till they had taken upon them the profession of Christianity, by being admitted

mitted to the Sacrament of Baptism. I know also that this Baptism, though it was not counted void, when it was Ministered in due form; yet it was never counted effectual to Salvation, but when a man is baptized into the true Faith; and that in the Unity of Gods Church. For though the names of Hereticks and Schismaticks, have been made only *Bug-bears* to fright children with, in this time of our troubles; yet so long as Christianity continues, those that separate themselves from the Church upon pretences concerning the substance of Faith, shall be properly counted *Hereticks*; But if the cause concern not the substance of Christianity, *Schismaticks*. And therefore Christianity consisting not only in believing, or purposing with the heart, but also in professing with the mouth; (first sincerely, then the true Faith, and lastly, by being baptized) he that professeth himself free to renounce his Christianity, as far as the mouth hath effectually renounced it; because he hath effectually drawn back that promise, upon condition whereof he was baptized; of professing Christianity to the death.

And truly, if every Christian State be the Church of God within the territories thereof, then cannot all Churches concur to make up that one Visible Church of God which our Creed professeth. For there is nothing more evidently true than the saying of *Plato*; that all States are naturally enemies one to another, especially those that are borderers. And this enmity, in our daies, consisteth visibly in those differences of Religion, upon which the neighbour Sovereignties of Christendom are now at distance. It is therefore no way imaginable, how all Christian States should concur to make up that *one visible Church* whereinto by being baptized, we obtain the spiritual and eternal privileges of Christians. But that it is the profession of the whole Rule of Christianity, that makes any people or State a part of the Visible Church; being governed by such rules, in the exercise of Gods service, as may make it the same Society with that, which was once unquestionably Gods Church, or part of it. For otherwise, how should the Visible Church continue one and the same, from the first to the second coming of our Lord?

And here you have the second point of our differences. For all our Sects, under the title of Gods *free Grace*, do maintain, that



that the promises of the Gospel, and our right in them, depends not upon the truth of mens Christianity. As if God were not free enough of his Grace, if he should reserve himself a duty of being served, as by Christians, upon those whom he tenders life ever lasting to, upon such terms. It is no new thing in *England*, to hear of those who profess, that God sees not, nor can see any sin in his elect. So that in their opinion, there is no mortal sin but repentance; because that must suppose, that a man thought himself out of the *state of Grace*, by the sin whereof he repents. I think I am duly informed of a Malefactor dying upon the Gallows, that professed, to the strengthening of his brethren, that he had overcome all temptation to repentance; acknowledging that, since his being in prison, he had been strongly moved to repent. And one of *Hacketts* three conspirators, when he was come to himself, continued to profess, that he thought himself in the state of Gods Grace all the while. But I will go no further than the words which I have quoted in another place, out of a Pamphlet written to satisfy the Godly party in *Wales*, being offended at the late Usurpers proceedings; which alledgeth that we are not to be judged at the last day, either by our Works, or by our Faith; but by Gods everlasting purpose concerning each of us; by virtue whereof Christ being alive at the heart, the violation of all his engagements to them, by usurping over them as over others, made no difference in his estate towards God. Whosoever writ this, I think I am duly informed, that himself caused it to be published. But I am certain that to the everlasting infamy of a Christian Nation, if reparation be not made, it is supposed to be the sense of all the Godly in it. And to the same effect, my memory assures me to have read in one of his speeches; that there are at this day inspirations of Gods Spirit *besides the Scriptures*, though not *against the Scriptures*. Now certainly, that which a man hath by virtue of the Scriptures; that is, of Christianity; can by no means be understood to be *besides the Scriptures*. And certainly, he that presumeth upon any motion of Gods Spirit, not supposing Christianity; that is, not supposing the Scriptures; may by the same reason presume of his own salvation, not supposing that he believes and lives as a Christian.

The same is the consequence of a Position, I will not say in-  
joyned

joyned by any party, but notoriously allowed among us; that justifying Faith consisteth in believing that a man is one of them, that are predestinate, whom God sent our Lord Christ to redeem, and none else. For how can he think himself obliged to make good the profession of a Christian, who thinks himself assured of all that he can attain to by so doing, not supposing it? Indeed it may be said, that our *Antinomians* and *Enthusiasts*, and other *Sects* among us, (whom no conceit without this could have seduced to their several frenzies,) do think themselves justified from everlasting, by Gods decree to send Christ for that purpose; whereas this opinion dateth Justification from the instant that God revealeth the said decree by his Spirit; in which *Revelation* they think that justifying Faith consisteth. And certainly, there can be no reason why God, receiving men into Grace, only in consideration of Christs obedience, should suspend their reconciliation upon that knowledge of his purpose, which he giveth them by Faith. For what can be more unreasonable, than that God should justify a man, by revealing to him that he is justified? But the opinion is not the less destructive to Christianity, because it is the more unreasonable. Now it is possible, that the effect of this position may be stifled, and become void in some, by reason of other truths which contradict the same indeed, and yet are believed by them, not seeing the consequence of their own persuasions. But those who besides this position, do pertinaciously hold absolute predestination to Glory, those I maintain, are in an error destructive to Christianity, that is, an *Herésie*. And therefore this Doctrine being such, it is no way enough, that it is no way injoynd to be taught; but it is requisite that it be disclaimed, by those that pretend to recover the Unity of a Visible Church. For there can be no Church, where any thing destructive to Christianity, which the being of the Church supposeth, is notoriously allowed to be taught.

Now between these two points of our differences, I am to observe a vast difference. For this latter is necessary for all Christians to know; as being the principle of all those actions, which being just for the matter of them, must render the men acceptable to God in order to life everlasting. And therefore he that thinketh he can be regenerate, or justified, or the child

child of God, or indowed with Gods Spirit, not supposing that he undertakes and performs the profession of a Christian, renounces the Article of his Creed, concerning *one baptism to remission of sins*. But the being of Gods Visible Church consisteth in that Unity, which ariseth upon the agreement of all Christians, to hold Communion in the Visible Offices of Gods service. And therefore, though it be an Article of our Creed to believe *one Catholick Church*; yet can it not concern the salvation of every particular Christian, to understand the nature of that *Society or Corporation*, which the bond of this Unity createth. Nay even they who are best seen in that Government, by which this Unity is preserved, may well fail in comprehending the reason thereof, by reflecting their discourse upon it. In the mean time, it is necessary for all that believe their Creed, to think themselves tied by this Article, to maintain the Unity of the Church, according to their estate; that is, for every ones part, not to be accessary to any Schism that dissolveth it. And therefore, to deny the crime of Schism is to deny this Article.

The consequence of this observation will be the difference which the Church hath reason to use, in reconciling parties at distance from it, to the Unity thereof; according to the difference of those pretences upon which they are at distance. For those who have only disputed against the being of the Church, upon misunderstanding the right of Secular Power, which they think the being of the Church inconsistent with) shall be sufficiently reunited to the Church, by conforming to the Law by which the Church is, and was, and may be established. For that there ought to be provision against such disputes for the future, it concerns not me to give warning. Only where willfullness hath proceeded so far in maintaining a false position, as to make no bones of denying Christianity and teaching Atheism, (by obliging to renounce Christ, if the Sovereign command it) it concerneth the Christianity of the Nation to see reparation made.

But where the Heretical positions mentioned afore have notoriously been maintained; especially where Congregations have been framed and used for the exercise of Religion, upon pretense of them; there will it be absolutely necessary, that they

they be expressly renounced and disclaimed, either by persons in particular, or in Body by Congregations. To this head I reduce all *Anabaptists* and Congregations of *Anabaptists*; those of the fifth *Monarchy*, and Congregations of the fifth *Monarchy*; *Quakers* and Congregations of *Quakers*. Nay, all *Independent* Congregations, in my opinion, ought to be reduced under this measure. Not only because their profession is grounded upon the denial of *one Visible Church*; but because they suppose themselves children of God, and endowed with his Spirit, before they be members of Gods Church; that is, setting aside their Baptism, and the Covenant which is solemnly enacted by it, between God and each Soul. And though I do refer my self to the wisdom of Superiours, in what form this reconciliation be solemnized; yet I must express my opinion thus far, that there can be none so fit, as that which the wisdom of the Catholick Church from the beginning hath always frequented; by granting them the Blessing of the Church, with Imposition of hands, renouncing for their part their several Sects and Errours; that is, by the Prayers of the Church, for the Spirit of God to rest upon them, who have barred their Baptism from giving it, by opposing the peace of the Church, which now they retire unto. For how shall the Unity of the Church be secured, but by declaring them who violate the same accursed of God?

Nor let it be thought, that our Sectaries of their own accord retiring themselves unto the Communion of this Church, it will be requisite for the Church to admit them, without taking notice of any thing that hath passed. For neither is it to be presumed, that they who have made their own wills their Law for so many years, will so much as profess conformity to the Rule of the Church; and if they did profess it, there is no reason to think that they should stand to it; having a dispensation dormant of the Spirit to stand to their profession, as the interest of their faction shall require. So their coming to Church would be only an advantage for them to infect others. And how should that Communion be counted a Church, which entertains Hereticks as Hereticks, and Schismatics as Schismatics; that is, without renouncing positions destructive to the Faith; without obliging themselves for the future to hold Unity with the Church? Certainly there is no just answer for this, if the Church of *Rome* should object it, for the reason why they refuse to

H h

hold

hold communion with us. Certainly *St. Augustine*, when he was charged by the *Donatists*, that the Church received their Apostates without rebaptizing them, and in their respective Orders; could have had no answer, if he had not had this; That the Church received them not as *Donatists*, but as converted from being *Donatists*, they not refusing to profess so much.

Certainly it may be, and perhaps is justifiable for the Secular Power to grant them the exercise of their Religion in private places of their own providing, under such moderate penalties, as the disobeying of the Laws of a mans Country might require. For persecution to death for that cause, the whole Reformation condemneth in the Church of *Rome*; and I conceive there is no reason for that, which will not condemn Persecution to banishment. But this would require the like moderation to be extended to Recusants of the Church of *Rome*. True it is, in mine opinion, those Papists that think themselves tied by the *Bull* of *Pius V.* against Queen *Elizabeth*; or that they may be tied by the like Acts of his Successors against hers, are justly liable to the utmost of penalties, as professed enemies to their Country. But besides that, it is manifest that all Papists are not of that opinion which the said *Bull* presupposeth, the State may easier be secured of Papists, against all such power in the Pope, than of our Sectaries against that dispensation to their Allegiance, which the pretense of Gods Spirit may import when they please.

And whereas it is manifest, that many Papists hold against those equivocations and reservations, which destroy all confidence of the Sovereign in his Subjects allegiance; how shall a State be secured against that infamous falshood of the late Urrper in any man that pretends Gods Spirit upon his terms, which I mentioned afore? Besides the Recusants, being for the most part of the good Families of the Nation, will take it for a part of their Nobility, freely to profess themselves in their Religion, if they understand themselves; whereas the Sectaries, being people of mean quality for the most part, cannot be presumed to stand upon their reputation so much. So if they cannot be tolerated in the exercise of their Religion, it must be provided upon what terms they may be received by the Church. And by that which hath been said, it may appear what my opinion will require of the Presbyterians, for the condition of reconciling

ciling our selves into one Church again; namely, in the first place, their submission to the Act, or Decree, or Order, according to which the Sectaries ought to be tied to renounce the damnable positions which they have notoriously set on foot. For if they should refuse this, what reason could be alledged, why they should be counted Strangers to that infection, which they will not exclude? As for the other Article of the Creed, concerning *one Visible Church*, it is evident that they cannot belong to that Church, supposing the Premisses. For it is evident that there was a time, when the whole Church was governed by Bishops; and that not against Gods Law, for then there had remained no Church. And therefore for them to break the Unity of the Church, upon pretense of Governing this Church by Presbyters, is to break Unity, unless a part may give Law to the whole; which who so do, are for so doing Schismatics. And the Church of *Rome* would have due cause to cast us off for Schismatics, if we should admit this pretense. But this is a point, the knowledge whereof cannot belong to the substance of Christianity for the reason alledged before. And therefore I do not think the Church tied to exact the express Profession of it, or the disclaiming of the error that is opposite to it. On the other side, the Church maintaining the Ordinations of Presbyters alone to be meer nullities in themselves, can never own their Ordinations without renouncing the Catholick Church; yet may it consent in the persons, upon their consent to the Order which shall be established for the future. And indeed, what can they challenge by the meer consent of certain Presbyters, which the Ministers of Congregations may not pretend to, by the consent of their respective Congregations? And yet, I suppose, both parties are agreed, not to own them in that Power which the celebration of the *Eucharist* importeth? Let any man that is capable to judge of such matters, think upon the madness of the *Lancashire* Presbyterians without prejudice; of whom I am duly informed, that they caused those who were ordained only Deacons in the Church of *England*, to do the office of Presbyters (which they had no title to) in celebrating the *Eucharist*; and tell me what reason there can be, excluding the Ordinations of the Congregations to admit the usurpations of the Presbyterians. As for the form and solemnity, in which the consent of the Church to their Ordinations



shall be celebrated, therein I refer my self to the wisdom of Superiours; thinking it would be a great impertinence in the Presbyterians, if finding a necessity of submitting those whom they have already promoted to the judgment of the Church, for the condition upon which they are to Minister, (which without doubt is the principal) they should insist upon the accessory, which is the form and solemnity by which the power is visibly conveyed. And thus I think the second great difficulty, concerning their Ordinations, may be composed.

Now supposing these great difficulties set aside, the composing of our first differences about the Order of Bishops and the Service, cannot seem difficult, if the parties be content to give up their engagements to the advantage, which the Christianity of the Nation may have by it. For what reasonable Christian may think much to acknowledge, that by reason of those partialities which at length have produced this Schism, the Ecclesiastical Laws of the Land are capable of amendment in those two points? On the other side, doth not dear experience tell all parts, that the change of them by force, though it must be called Reformation, if the Law of the Land call it so, yet it is not likely to be that which it is called? Besides, consider the kindness which his Majesties Return, and Gods goodness that hath over-ruled mens hearts in it, hath bred in all parties consenting to it. For can we have this before us, and not hope that it will be enough to subdue all prejudices and animosities to the interest of our common Christianity? Had the Peace of the Church never been questioned, it might be charity in a discreet Christian, not to call it into question by proposing what might be amended; because the hope of amendment might not countervail the danger of that Peace. But now that Unity is not to be had, without settling of agreement in matters of difference; to propose what may seem best for the Community of Gods Church in the cure of our breaches, is not to give offense, but to take it away.

I will therefore premise here one consideration, which I mean to assume for a supposition, to ground that which I shall propose to this purpose. It shall contain that which I observe in the New Testament, and the primitive practice of Gods Church pointing out the meaning of it, concerning the difference between the *Clergy* and *People* in all Churches, and the ground of it. For  
though

though the edict of our Lord in the Gospel be peremptory, that *whoſo forſakeſh not all things, cannot be my Diſciple*, that is, a Chriſtian; (for they who were other whiles called *Diſciples*, were called *Chriſtians* at Antiochia, as we read in the *Acts*;) yet common reaſon evinceth, that all Diſciples profeſſed not to forſake the World, (which we all profeſs to forſake at our Baptiſm) according to the ſame rate. For we ſee by the Gospel, that the voluntary oblations of thoſe who followed our Lord, miniſtring to him, made a ſtock of money, which Judas was truſted with for charity to the Poor, after that his Followers were provided for. But it is againſt the evidence of common ſenſe to imagine, that all thoſe who profeſſed to follow Chriſt, and to be his Diſciples, were provided for out of this Stock. It is true our Lord promiſeth in the Gospel, that whoſoever ſhall forſake kindred, or wife, or houſe, or goods, for the Goſpel, ſhall receive an hundred fold here, and in the World to come life everlaſting. A thing viſibly fulfilled in the primitive ſtate of the Church; when, whoſoever was perſecuted for Chriſtianity, all Chriſtians acknowledged themſelves bound to provide for his ſupport. Neither can it be ſaid, how St. Paul ſaying, that *godlineſs hath the promiſe of this life, and of that which is to come*, could be otherwiſe fulfilled; when thoſe who had undertaken Chriſts Croſs were ſubject to powers, that did or might perſecute Chriſtianity at their pleaſure. But though all Chriſtians in caſe of Perſecution, are bound by their Baptiſm to leave all they have, that they may carry Chriſts Croſs after him; yet it was ſomething more that St. Peter meant when he ſaid, *Lord we have left all to follow thee; what ſhall we have?* For though a Net and a Fiſher-boat were no great thing to leave; yet ſo firm a Faith as to forſake a mans whole courſe of living, caſting himſelf upon the word of Chriſt for his very being, whether here or in the World to come, is ſuitable to the promiſe that follows, of *ſitting upon twelve Thrones to judge the twelve Tribes of Iſrael*. The Chriſtians of Jeruſalem, who parted with their Eſtates, that the Diſciples might be maintained in their daily attendance upon Gods ſervice, cannot be ſaid to have obtained thereby any common rank in the Church. But it muſt be ſaid, that quitting their former courſe and ſtate of living, by quitting the means of maintaining it, they became from thenceforth, either of the Clergy, or of the

the Poor, which were always maintained out of the stock of the Church. For by *St. Pauls* instructions to *Timothy*, *1 Tim. 5.* it appeareth, that those Widows which were employed and maintained by the Church for the common necessities of it, were to be taken out of such as were destitute of means to live otherwise.

Herewith agreeth an infinite number of examples in the primitive Church, of godly Bishops, Priests, and others of the Clergy, who taking upon them such Professions, divested themselves of Worldly goods; whether applying them to the property, or only to the use of the Church; as reserving themselves power to dispose of them, in favour of friends or kindred, at their death. And from the same reason and ground proceed all the Canons, whereby it was provided, that they should not dispose of the Church goods to such uses at death; but of their own, well and good. For whatsoever their estates were, though they renounced them not, yet it became necessary for them to live as others of the Clergy lived; who were generally poor when they were promoted, and therefore professed to content themselves with meer necessities, because the Church goods of which they lived, were due to the maintenance of the Poor, as well as of the Clergy. From whence we may see, what truth there is in those sayings of the Fathers, which make the Precepts of our Lord, in his Sermon upon the Mount, matters of Counsel. For if all Christians be to leave all things that they may follow Christ, it is certain that they are commanded, and not only avised, to *turn the other cheek, so quit a mans Coat to him that takes away his Cloak*, to undergo the rest of those Precepts whereby our Lord describeth the duty of a Christian; provided they be so understood, as the maintenance of a mans estate in the World, and the obligations which it inferreth, even by virtue of that Christianity which alloweth the same, will require. But if there be another estate in the Church of Disciples which profess to follow Christ, leaving the employment of the World for that purpose, and therefore to forbear the pleasures and profits thereof accordingly: That strict rate, and that high degree in which they profess to leave the World to follow Christ, must needs be meer matter of Counsel; because no man is commanded to undertake that estate, but invited to it for the securing of his Salvation, who knows he may be saved without it. Whereby it appears,

appears, that this estate imports a profession of abstinence from the pride, the revenge, the lusts and pleasures of the world, as well as from the riches of it; as well of the humility, the patience, the continence, the meekness and obedience of our Lord, as of the mean estate in which he lived; but that for the means to compass this end, it imports first a profession of renouncing the rank and estate which every man holds in the world: and of dedicating himself to the service of the Church, and that employment which tends to the common good of Christians.

If it should be inferred from hence, That the state of the Clergy, importing the forsaking of the World at this extraordinary Rate, must therefore import the profession of single life, as some of the Church of *Rome* would have it; the answer is, that it will not follow. And the instance is peremptory, That the Apostles themselves, who thus left the World, did not profess it. And if by undertaking the Clergy, a man was not obliged to renounce his goods, as appears by those Canons which enable the Clergy to dispose of them at death; much less doth that estate import a profession of single life, being more difficult to perform, than to live as a Clergy-man upon the Church goods. For it is possible for them who have wives to live as if they had them not, according to *St. Paul*; no other wise than it is possible for them who have the dispensing of Church goods, to use them as if they used them not. The reason of single life for the Clergy is firmly grounded by the Fathers and Canons of the Church, upon the Precept of *St. Paul*, forbidding man and wife to part, unless for a time to attend upon Prayer. For Priests and Deacons being continually to attend upon occasions of celebrating the *Eucharist*, which ought continually to be frequented; if others be to abstain from the use of Marriage for a time for that purpose, then they always. And this is the reason that prevailed so far, even in the Primitive times, that the instances which are produced to the contrary, during those times, seem to argue no more than dispensation in a Rule, which had the force of a Law, when an exception took not place; that is, when those that were thought necessary for the service of the Church, thought not fit to tie themselves to live single.

But this profession was evidently the ground for that Discipline, which was used all over the Church in breeding youth from tender years to such a strict course of life, as only use and custom

custom is able to render agreeable to mans nature. And to this education and discipline, all the authority and credit of the Clergy over the people is to be imputed; the dissolution whereof, is the true occasion of the miseries which we have seen. For did the people think themselves tyed to depend upon the Clergy for their instructions, to admit their admonitions and reproofs in matters of Religion; (that is, did the discipline and education of the Clergy maintain them in that authority with the people) it is not possible, that the Pride which hath been seen in setting up new Religions, and giving new Laws to the Church, should take place. But this Authority is not to be preserved without retirement from the World; that is, from conversation with the People, of what rank or degree soever, whether upon pretense of profit or pleasure. And therefore being once lost by the debauches of the Clergy before the Reformation, it is not to be restored without restoring the ground of it, the said education and discipline; nor by consequence, the Reformation to be counted compleat otherwise; supposing always the Reformation to be the restoring of that Church which hath been, not the building of that which hath not been. The same education and discipline is, by the express Canons of the Church, the ground of that title upon which promotion is due to the Clergy in their respective Churches. For what is more against the Rules of the Church, then to take such men for Priests and Bishops of such Churches, as men know not how they behaved themselves in lower degrees? Those that talk of the Interest of the People in Ecclesiastical promotions, without supposing this ground, do alledge nothing but their own dreams to bring their own dreams to pass.

Having this premised, I must needs say, I see no manner of inconvenience in that which the Presbyterians pretend for the chief cause of their distance; that is, the concurrence of Presbyters with their Bishops, in Ordinations and the Jurisdiction of the Church; provided it be settled in that form, which being grounded upon the Rule of the Catholick Church, may tend to restore and advance the common Christianity.

Now I take the Rule of the Church to be as evidently this, as the common Christianity is evident; that every City, with the Territory thereof, be the seat and content of the Church. For though it hath been used with so much difference in several parts  
and



parts and times of the Church, that those Countries, which some whiles, and some where, might have been cast into four-score Churches, have other whiles, and elsewhere been cast into four; yet these are but exceptions to a Rule, which the Law saith, do not destroy, but confirm it. For in matters concerning the Whole, the Unity of the Whole may as well be preserved by the concurrence of four, as of fourscore.

The Churches, (that is, according to this Rule) the Diocesses of *England*, have been constituted and distinguished upon occasion of the Sovereignities, in which, and by consent whereof, the Christianity of the Nation was first planted. He that considers with half an eye, shall easily see, how the conversion of *Kent*, of the *East*, and *South*, and *West Saxons*, of the *East Angles* and *Mercians*, and lastly of *Northumberland*, produced the foundation of English Churches. For of the British foundations, in the *West* parts of the *Island*, from the two fourths to the Lands end, the same account is to be kept; the Dominion of the *Britans* being for some time divided into several Sovereignities. He that is convicted of this truth, (which no man can be convicted of, but he that considereth the case; but who so considereth the case, must needs stand convict of it) will easily grant me, that when the Monarchy prevailed, and *England* came to be divided into Counties, the General Rule of the Church would have required another course to have been observed. For had the Head Town of every County been made the Seat of a Church containing that County, no man that surveys the division of the *Roman Empire* into Churches (made without the secular Power, as before *Constantine*) will deny, that the division so made would have been more correspondent to the primitive form, tending to the Unity of the whole.

But let no man think that for the love of such a correspondence, I have any itch to call in question the Unity of the Whole. The Alteration is great, and must needs produce a great motion, to ingraff it into the Laws of the Kingdom. And therefore I am not of opinion to change the Law for hope of amendment, with so much appearance of danger to the being of the Whole. But I am of opinion, that it would be easie to erect Presbyteries; that is, Colledges of Presbyters, in all Shire Towns which have no Cathedral Churches; for the



Ecclesiastical Government of the respective Counties, with and under the Bishops; and that so the Rule of the Church would be set on work, to the best effect and purpose. For those Towns have commonly Churches altogether unprovided of means, through the horrible sacrileges that have passed, and yet in common reason, (agreeing with the wisdom of Gods Spirit, from whence the Rule of Episcopacy issued) ought to be Nurseries of Christianity to the respective Counties. And that intent cannot so well be brought to effect, as by planting the wisest, and those that have most of the Clergy in their lives, in the most eminent places with authority next to the Chief, over their respective bounds. By the ministry of such persons, the Offices of Gods service might so be performed in the chief places, as might be a pattern for their Country Churches to follow. These Presbyters might grow up by education, in that discipline of the Clergy, which I have recommended upon the experience of the whole Church. They might live a Collegiate life in common, exercising a care and inspection over Inferiors; together with the charge of instructing or seeing them instructed in the Scriptures. The Canon of the whole Church confining all degrees of the Clergy to their respective Churches, might be revived by their means; the superseding whereof, being certainly one of the irregularities of the Papacy, hath condaced much to the dissolution of Discipline in the Church. For in conscience, how can he that is obliged to any Church, give account of himself to another, to which the first is not subordinate? And therefore, though the Presbyteries which I propose be not Churches, yet may they take account of their respective Clergy, and render it to their Bishops. The promotion of inferior Orders, belonging unto their account, may proceed upon the account which they give. The censures that are requisite to pass *in foro exteriori* may pass them in the first instance, and from them being transmitted to the Bishop, be either enacted or voided; always with right of appeal to the Synod of the Province, in cases of weight, and in the intervals thereof to their Deputies: To which purpose and in which nature, the High Commission ought to be revived. For as it is by no means to be allowed, that the Bishops negative be any way questioned; So is it no way fit, that the consent of Bishop and Presbyters both be concluded in one and the same instance. As for those Diocesses

Diocesses which are concluded within only one County; there I suppose, I need not say, that the Chapter of the Cathedral are by inheritance this Presbytery.

Now these Colledges of Presbyters consisting of those only, that shall have run the whole course of their lives in the education and discipline of the Clergy; is there any possible pretense of burthen upon them, if the condition of single life should be required, to qualifie them for their places? For this were not to tie any man to single life, seeing who will may go forth and be provided of a Country Church; but it were to maintain the discipline of the Clergy, in the most eminent places, wherein there is a course proposed to them who imbrace it, of ending their days in it. And the course of a Collegiate life, which I propose, seemeth a sufficient means and advantage to overcome those temptations, which in these days, may seem too difficult for all the Clergy to undergo.

As for the means of supporting these Presbyteries, wherein the Cure of all Parishes within the Shire-Towns is provided for, and included; it is no difficulty to him that considers with conscience that originally, the indowment of the Diocess was the Patrimony of the Mother Church; and afterwards appropriated to Parish Churches, by abating the right of the Mother Church, upon particular contracts, appearing to be for the good of the parts. For if the Mother Church have abated so much of her common right when it was for the good of the Parishes; Is it not necessary, that the Parishes now abate of their property in their respective indowments, by Pensions to these Colledges, now they appear to be for the good of the Diocess? And this I am now bold to profess, though superiors do not go before in it, because I am confident, that by this position, I abate not a hair of that Power which the Bishops in *England* now use: But I add much to the strictness of discipline, (that is, in effect, of Christianity) by requiring all ordinations, all acts of Jurisdiction *in foro exteriori*, to pass both the Presbyters and the Bishop in several instances, And further then this I extend not the opinion of a Divine to particulars; but leave the rest intire to the wisdom of Superiors. And this may serve to show, that there is no cause why the difference on foot, concerning the Government of the Church, may not settle into a change conducing to the advancement of the common Christianity.

Which will hold still stronger in the other, concerning the Service,

vice, if men take their measures by the common interest of Christianity, not by their particular prejudices. For I conceive, I may well suppose, that the Sectaries pretence of praying by the Spirit is content to be buried in oblivion and silence; considering that the excesses are evident, and horrible, which that pretence hath brought forth. Besides that no man now stands to that dangerous position; that the Offices of Gods service are of no effect, when they are ministred by such as are not in the state of Grace. For I presume it is not, nor can be supposed on any hand, that all whom the Church must employ, are indowed with Gods Spirit; that is, are in the state of Grace. I suppose further, as not questioned on any hand, that the publick service of God is to consist of the praises of God, (by the Psalms of *David*, and other Hymns of Gods Church) of the reading of the Scriptures, of the instruction of Gods people out of them; in fine, of the Prayers of the Church, and in the chief place, of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, and those prayers which it is to be celebrated with.

Some of our Sects have been bold to pretend, that the Psalter or Psalms of *David*, are impertinent to the Devotions of Christians; as concerning the particular condition of *David*, and composed with regard to it. Whereby they overthrow the foundation of Christianity, standing upon this supposition; that the Old Testament is the figure and shadow of the New, and that Christ hath the key of the writings, as well as of *the house of David*. For seeing Christ and his mystical Body, the Church, are all one, the meaning and intent of the Psalms cannot concern Christ, but it must end in his Church. But seeing the Church is but shadowed in the Psalms, being part of the Old Testament; I can expect no dispute of the necessity of other Hymns, composed under Christianity, in the solemnizing of Gods publick service. And seeing the question on foot concerns the settling of the Form of Gods service by a Law of the Kingdom; there can remain no dispute concerning the necessity of a settled Order in reading the Scriptures, and using the Psalms and Hymns of the Church. Nor do I know any man, sincerely professing the Reformation, that could not wish with all his heart, that the whole order & form to be settled, with the circumstance of the same, might be according to the primitive simplicity, and naked plainness of the antient Church; supposing the difference between the state in which the Church

Church lived under persecution, and now that being protected by the secular Power, it receiveth all the World to take part in the service of God, For what difference this will infer in the Order and Rule of Gods service, to be enacted by a Law of this Kingdom; common reason, and the perpetual practice of Gods Church, together with the precedents recorded in Scripture, must be admitted to Witnes.

These things supposed, no man doubt, that the form of Service now in force by the Law of this land, may be acknowledged capable of amendment, without disparagement; either to the wisdom of the Church, that prescribed, or of the Nation that enacted it. For what positive Law of man is there that is not? Nay what arrogance can it be in a particular person, (having bestowed more consideration upon it, then it is possible, that those who had the framing of it should have leisure to do) to think that he knows some particulars, in which it might be mended? For neither doth it follow, that it is better to indanger the spoiling of it by calling it in question, then to let it rest as it is: And that particular person, whosoever he is, that should think his own opinion necessary to be followed, without compromising it to the publick, would justly incur the mark of arrogance. Since therefore that this is the time for such a debate, if any change be pretended; and that the reasons mentioned afore, are of sufficient consideration to oblige all sides to prefer unity before prejudice; what remains, but that either it be left intire in that State wherein it stands, or that nothing be changed without sufficient debate of reason upon the whole, what is fit to be changed what not?

But one thing I must here expressly stand upon, because the form of Gods Service which hath been usurped during the Schism; protesteth against the Law in force. I acknowledge that the whole Reformation protesteth against the insufficiency and defects of the Church of *Rome*, in the course which it taketh for the instruction of Christian people in the duties of their Christianity; against the abuses there practised, in celebrating the Eucharist without any pretence of a Communion, in private Masses; and in serving God in a Language which the people understand not. For these abuses are a principal part of the ground for that change, which we justly maintain to be Reformation; the

the boldness of those that opposed it, being come to such a height as openly to maintain, that it concerneth not Christian People to know, or to mind what is done at the Mass, (being the ordinary service of God, for which they come to Church,) or what is said: But that the intention of the Priest is enough to apply the sacrifice of Christ to all that are present, (which they think it doth no less to them that are absent; and therefore leave us unsatisfied why people should come to Church) who need do nothing but say their *Paters* and their *Aves*. These abuses I do acknowledge. But be the World my witness, and all that know what hath passed, for the matter of Religion in the World; was it ever protested by those who demand Reformation in the Church, that the *Eucharist* ought to be celebrated but four times or twelve times in the year? That by Gods Law, there ought to be two Sermons every Sunday in every Church? That other Festivals beside the Sunday, and set times of Fasting ought not to be solemnized with the service of God? That the Church doors ought not to be open but when there is preaching? Take the primitive practice of the Church along with the Scripture, and they shall tell you another tale; that Prayer, and the praises of God, is the more principal end of Christian Assemblies, than Preaching. The reason is unanswerable; for the one is the end, the other the means. That the celebration of the *Eucharist* is the most principal Office of Gods service under Christianity, is no less evident. For other Offices are common to Judaism; this consisting most in Prayers, consists of those Prayers which are proper to Christianity; that is to those causes wherein our Salvation consisteth. And can there be question how frequent it ought to be? Shall not the practice of the whole Church, from the beginning, decide the question, if any remain? The single life of the Clergy prevailed for this end, that they might be always ready to celebrate the *Eucharist*, say the Fathers, and the Canons, which I alledged afore. It is a question in *Genadeus de dogmatibus Ecclesiasticis*, whether every man ought to communicate every day or not. But therefore no question, that it ought to be celebrated every day, that who so would might communicate. In conscience would they be bound to Preach every day, that are so much for Preaching? After the reading of the Scripture, follows the Sermon, and after that the *Eucharist*;



rift : This is the primitive order of the whole Church, at that solemn service, when the Eucharist (on Fasting-days in the Evening, on other days before Noon) was Celebrated. After the Scriptures were read, the people were taught their duty out of them. A thing necessary and possible. Not that every Curate should be bound to declaim by the Glass; but that he should be bound to instruct his Parish out of the Scriptures which are read. If he be tyed to preach as often as the Church door opens, the Church door must be shut; because no sides can hold out, so oft as Christians ought to meet for Gods service. I call the World to witness, is it not as much a work of lungs and sides, as an Office of Gods Service; which takes up the time of their Church Assemblies? Is not the way opened, by this means to declaim of publick Government in Church and State, to entertain the hearers? For alas, should men confine themselves to that which the generality of their audience might edifie by, in their Christianity, the Trade would be obstructed-

For let mee freely say, the undoubted truth of the common Christianity, (which no Sermons ought to exceed, because they pretend the edification of the generality of Christians) is contained in so narrow a compass; that no eloquence (much less, the eloquence of all that must come into the pulpit) can change the seasoning and serving of it, so as to make it agreeable to mens palats; without fetching in matter impertinent, if not destructive to the Common Christianity. And the same is, for more peremptory reason, to be said of arbitrary Prayers. For the very posture of him, that pretendeth to prefer the devotions of Gods people to the Altar which is above, strongly impresseth upon the hearts of simple Christians, an opinion, that thereby they discharge to God the duty which he requires at their hands. Which if the matter of those prayers be such as the common Christianity requires, they may do indeed. But if it be possible, that Rebellion, Slander, Nonsense and Blasphemy may be the matter of them, as well as Christianity; then is it not Religion, but Superstition which such devotions exercise: Nor can that Kingdom stand excused to God, which shall gratifie that licentiousness, whereof they see the effect before their eyes. All reason of Christianity concurs with the practise of the whole Church, to witness, that the interest of Christianity



nity requires the service of God to be maintained and exercised daily, (yea hourly, were it possible) not only by particular Christians, but by Assemblies of Christians, so far as the business of the World will give leave, and as there is means to maintain mens attendance upon it. There may come abuse in the order the form, the matter of that which is tendred to God for his Service. But in stead of reforming those abuses, to take away the means, the Rule, the obligation of such meetings, is meer Sacriledg, in destroying, (under pretence of Reforming) Gods Church.

And though I charge no such design upon those who maintain the obligation of the Sabbath to consist in two Sermons; yet I do maintain, it is manifest to common reason, that the form which that opinion introduceth necessarily tends to that effect. Strange it is that a Nation capable of sense, in an age improved by Learning, should be intangled with the superstition of so vain an imagination; that God by the same fourth Commandment, should oblige both Jews to keep the Saturday, and Christians the Sunday; Especially no man daring to maintain, that both were, or are tyed to the same measure of resting. And therefore though, (rather then cross the stream of such a superstition; For let no man think, that all superstition can be shut out of Gods Church) there may be reason to live conformable to the Rules which such superstition produceth; Yet provided that the Ecclesiastical Laws of *England*, agreeing with the Laws of the Whole Church, be not abated, so as to stick an evident mark of Schism upon the Church of *England*. For the Law that is recommending the celebration of the Eucharist, upon all Sundays and Festivals; but commanding the Service to be used, as well on Festivals and Fasting days, as upon Sundays, (beside the week days) at the publick Assemblies of respective Congregations; to change this order for two Sermons on the Sunday alone, what is it but to renounce the whole Church, for the love of those that have divided from the Church of *England*, upon causes common to it with the whole Church?

They that would have the Reformation of the Church to be indeed that which the Law of the Land calleth it, should first provide a course to be established for Law, by which all Christian souls, (who have equal interest in the common salvation) might

might serve God in publick all Sundays and Festivals. For seeing there was a course in Law before the Reformation, for all servants as well as others, to be at Mass all Sundays and Festivals; and the Church was enabled to require account of it at their hands, it will not be Reformation to abrogate the abuses of the Mass till a course be taken, that all Christians may frequent that, which shall appear to be indeed the service of God instead of the Mass. Let no Preachers flatter themselves with an opinion, that they shall ever make Christians so perfectly Jews, as to perswade them to dress no meat on the Sundays. If Servants must stay at home to dress meat on Sundays; (and for other occasions they must stay at home besides that) will not the way to repair that breach be, to enjoyn several Assemblies in all Parish Churches upon all Sunday Mornings, that several Persons of several Estates and Qualities, may have opportunity to attend the publick service of God at several hours of the same Sundays and Holy days? For though I understand very well, that this would impose upon the Church; (that is, upon my Brethren of the Clergy,) a greater burthen, than an afternoons meal of a Sermon; (which all men know, is furnished of the cold meat of the fore-noon) yet it is necessary that the World should be cleared of this imposture that reigneth; that two Sermons every Sunday, is the due way of keeping the Sabbath among Christians, or of advancing Gods publick service.

I will not here dispute, that the Lent-fast was instituted by the Apostles. But this I maintain to be evident, that the Fast afore the Resurrection of Christ is, and was as ancient as the Feast of his Resurrection; and that more ancient than the keeping of all Lords-days in the year, being merely the reflection of that one all the weeks of the year. Nor will any man, that knows what he says, ever question that the enlarging of it to forty days is a just Law, voluntarily undertaken by the Whole Church, not to be condemned without the like mark of Schism. For since the World is come into the Church, is there not manifest reason, that more time should be taken for the expiating of more sins, which are the sins of more People? to prepare as well the Elder, to renew their Christianity by communicating at *Easter*; as the younger to be confirmed and come first to the Communion at *Easter*, now they are baptized Infants? Which in former ages was the time of their first coming to Baptism.

As for the *Wednesdays* and *Fridays*, if we shall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, unless our Righteousness exceed the Righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees; and if it be evident, as evident it is, that the *Scribes* and *Pharisees* prescribed *Mondays* and *Thursdays* for days of less solemn Assemblies than the Sabbath; how shall we enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, if in despite of the whole Church, which hath hitherto used *Wednesdays* and *Fridays* in lieu of *Mondays* and *Thursdays*, used by the Synagogues, we void the Law of *England* by which they are in force? Of the Ceremonies the same is to be understood, not because it can be within the compass of common reason to imagine, that the same Ceremonies have continued from the time that the Church was persecuted into holes and caves of the Earth to this time, in which the question is of seeing Christianity by the Law of this Kingdom. It were want of common understanding to think that the same could serve; but because so few and so inobedient as we are cannot be condemned without condemning, not only Gods whole Church, but also Gods ancient People, who will evidently be found in the same cause.

One thing hath been cast forth in barr to all this, which we must not swallow whole, unless we mean to impose upon our selves. It is the pretence of complying with the Reformed Churches: for it is evident, that there are four forms of Reformation extant; one according to *Luther*, another according to *Calvin*, the third is, that of the Church of *England*, and in the last place, (though first for time, because least known, and protected by no Sovereign) I name that the Union in *Bohemia*. For we are to know, that the Followers of *John Husse* having sent Deputies to the Council of *Basil*, they accorded to re-unite the Nation upon four Articles; the chief whereof was the Communion in both kinds. They that stood to the accord, are to this day called thereupon *Calvinists*, or *subvervans* in Latin. But another part of those that were at distance, thinking themselves betrayed by their Deputies in that accord, proceeded to settle themselves in a form of Religion, and the service of God, by that which they held the pure truth of God in all points that had been disputed. The Emperour *Ferdinand I.* King of *Bohemia*, having subdued his Subjects there, that rose with the Protestants in *Germany*, cast a good part of these out of the Country; who finding shelter in *Polonia* and *Prussia*, there planted and

and propagated their form, till the troubles of our time ; when by the Emperours victory in *Bohemia*, and the late troubles in *Poland*, they seem to be at a low ebb, though they impute it to the decay of their first discipline.

They that would reform the Church of *England*, professing already that Reformation which it found best, will they not first shew us reason, why we are to leave *Luther* for *Calvin*? For if they mean his form, when they talk of conforming us to the reformed Churches, because of the *Scotts* Presbyteries; they must have better arguments than either the Learning or the Christianity of the *Scottish* Presbyterians will yield to perswade us. They say, those that framed the Reformation in *England*, being bred under *Melancthon* among the *Lutherans*, followed them much an end in the order and form which they prescribed. But is that any reason for any change, before it appear which is in the right? I freely profess I find *Melancthon* the better learned, and the more Christian spirit. But the Church of *England*, which in divers points differeth from both, why should it be thought to follow either for any reason; but as either agrees with the Catholick Church? And for that I prefer the Unity of *Bohemia* before both; for they had the rule of *Vincentius* given them, to take their measure by the consent of the Catholick Church, and those things which have always and every where been professed and practiced in it: And had they done nothing but what is justifiable by that Rule, I should not blame them for that which I blame in them most. But where they agree not with *Luther* and *Calvin*, wherein do they not agree with the Church of *England*?

In particular, they sent all over the World to inform themselves of a visible succession of Bishops, whose profession was such, that they might derive the Ordination of Bishops for their Churches from their hands. They took the Superstitions of the *Greeks* to be such, that they could not own it from them. In that I think they were in the wrong. For I doubt not, the *Greeks* would have granted them Ordination only under the profession of the Catholick Church, and that had been enough. But thinking themselves in a strait of necessity, they chose twelve by lots; and hearing that the *Waldenses* lived in *Austria* under Bishops, deriving their succession from the time of *Constantine*, (and therefore from the Apostles) they sent them thither to be

Ordained, protesting against their weakness in going to Mass for fear. The protestation was admitted, and the persons ordained Bishops. Now I take not upon me to maintain the truth of that Information, concerning the succession of these Bishops whereupon they proceeded. But they being reasonably perswaded of it, and not knowing how to proceed otherwise, (through a mistake or an exigent, which they could not overcome) and settling themselves upon an innocent presumption; why should the effect of these Ordinations seem questionable? For under these Bishops, they have subsisted from that day to this.

And with what conscience is it demanded for conformity to the Reformation, that we acknowledge them Priests who are ordained against Bishops? If we do not, we shall condemn those Reformed Churches, which have no Bishops. Is it the fashion, that a man quit his cloak, because his fellow hath none? Or is it any thing else to renounce a good Title, because they cannot plead it? There was a good expedient in the ancient Church to refer things to God, which could not be decided without a breach in the Church. Let their zeal against the abuses of the Church of *Rome* be counted pardonable with God, which caused them to think the Order of Bishops a support of Antichrist; whereas the Papacy is visibly raised upon the rights of Bishops which it ingrosseth. Let the difficulty of procuring Ordinations, and having Bishops, render them excusable to God. Those that are ordained by Presbyters against Bishops, on purpose to set up Altar against Altar, how can we count them ordained, refusing the concurrence of the Church to their Ordinations? They that would tie us to comply with the Reformation, are first to shew us, that the Unity of *Bohemia* is no part of it; and that their Reformation is not to be preferred, either before that of *Luther*, or that of *Calvin*. For can we acknowledge the Ordinations of Presbyters against their Bishops, and not condemn them, that sought all over the World for Bishops to ordain them Bishops, that the Bishops so ordained might ordain them Presbyters?

But not only in this prime point of our differences, but also in the difference of the Clergy from the People, in the three Orders of Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons, in the matter of Justification and the *Eucharist*, of Confirmation and Penance,



Penance, of the Festivals and Fasts of the Church, and of divers Orders and Institutions of less consequence, their Profession agreeeth with the ancient Church, and the Church of *England*, where it departeth from both *Luther* and *Calvin*. In the matter of Penance (though with much humility) they tell the *Lutherans* roundly, they have but one of the Keys, viz. that of loosing, but bind not, as pronouncing absolution without enjoying of Penance. The discipline of *Geneva* they magnifie indeed, as they find it described by *Bodine* in his method of Histories; but they distinguish not, whether they mean the civil discipline, which the Laws of that State enforce, or that which the Power of the Keys, exercised there according to *Calvin*, doth constitute. For the Civil Law of a Christian State (especially no bigger than that of *Geneva*) may settle such a discipline over the outward man, as may restore from the outward act of sin, without mortifying the inward man to the inward Love of God. The late Usurpers Army we have seen well disciplined against the ordinary Vices of the Camp, who appearing now to have been then enemies to their Country, are thereby discovered not to have followed the reward of Christians, but of Souldiers. And the Laws of Christian States, by the means of Christianity which they maintain, may reach to the mortifying of sin, and the quickning of righteousness at the heart; but of themselves, being Civil Laws, and proposing no further reward or punishment, than that good which a mans Country signifies; they reach no further than the outward man, for the better or for the worse. Nor is it of any greater consequence to Christianity, that the outward act of sin or virtue is repressed or encouraged, by the rewards and penalties of Civil Laws. But when the discipline of the Church takes place, he who forfeiteth his Christianity by gross sin that is notorious, forfeiteth also Communion with the Church; and recovereth it not till the presumption be no less notorious, that he hath recovered his Christianity. Now communion with the Church is the consequence of our Baptism, which intitleth us to life everlasting. Therefore it is not duly forfeited, without forfeiting the effect of Baptism, our right to life everlasting. So our right to Heaven depending upon the communion of the Church, the discipline of the Church must needs reach the inward man as effectually, as any outward application can reach the heart, which



is invisible. For the presumption is grounded upon visible works of Penance, the effects of that invisible disposition, without which they could not be constantly brought forth. Whether or no this discipline be visible at *Geneva*, I will not pronounce. This I undertake, that comparing the Doctrine of *Calvin* with their Orders, they need not set a value upon the Power of the Keys exercised according to his doctrine, in comparison of the same exercised according to their own Orders. So that supposing, not granting, that the Laws of the Church of *England*, (being the Laws of the primitive Catholick Church) are to be changed for conformity with the Reformed Churches; it followeth not therefore, that they are to be changed for those of the Churches reformed according to *Calvin*. Certainly, the receiving of the Communion kneeling, having been one of the Orders of their Reformation from the beginning, and so stilly insisted upon by them in *Poland*; they that pretend to change the Law of *England* in that point for conformity with the Reformation, think they have not men, but beasts to deal with.

The Church of *England* in the *Communion against Sinners*, hath declared a great zeal for the renewing of that ancient discipline of Penance, which was in force in the primitive Church. And certainly the Church of *England* is not the Church of *England* but in Name, till the power of Excommunication be restored unto it, which there was not, nor ever can be sufficient cause to take from any Church. But the discipline of Penance, though depending upon the Power of Excommunication, is as much to be preferred before it, as it is more desirable to bring men to the Church, than to shut them out of it. If prejudice and faction have not more to do in the pretences of this time, than the truth of Christianity, and zeal to advance it; it is a point that cannot be neglected in any deliberation of Reforming the Church. I cannot render a more visible reason, why so godly a zeal in those that first prescribed our Reformation to the restoring of Penance, hath not been improved by their Successors; than the partialities which sprung up in it like Tares in the Wheat, and have now prevailed to choke even the power of Excommunication, wherein the being of a Church consisteth. And though many sins of this Nation may be alledged, for the cause why God hath taken this sharp revenge upon us; yet can no reason be so proper, why he should permit the hedge of

of the Church to be cast down, (for all Sects to devour, and tread his Vineyard under foot) by suffering the power of Excommunication to be taken from it; as the neglect of improving it in, and to the discipline of Penance. True it is, not only all capital, but all infamous crimes, whereof men are convicted by Law, are thereby notorious and require this discipline, no less than those which the Law of this Land punisheth not otherwise than by Penance. And if the Church did make a difference among those that die by publick Justice; owning only those, who approve their desire to undergo regular Penance in case they might survive; then were this discipline visible, no visible crime escaping it. For all capital and infamous crimes that are not actually punished with death, must by that reason remain unreconciled to the Church, though free of the Law, till Penance be done. And losing crimes that are not known cannot be cured upon easier terms than those that are; would not the judgment of the Law, authorizing the Church in the cure of known sins, move even them that believe their Christianity no further than it is authorized by Law, to submit invisible sins to the same cure? For what is it, but the slighting of this cure, that makes mens sins fester and rankle inwardly, and break out into greater and greater excesses? And therefore to debate of Ceremonies and words in the Service, and May-poles, and Sabbath-days journeys, not considering the Power of the Keys, upon which the Church is founded, and the restoring of the same; is to neglect a consumption at the heart, pretending only to cure the hair, or the nails.

Now if any of our Sects insist upon a pretence that deserves to be insisted upon, far be it from us to cast off the consideration of it, because they have unduly separated from the Church for it. Our *Anabaptists*, it is known, insist upon two points; the baptizing of Infants, and that by sprinkling, not by dipping. In both they have neglected St. *Peters* Doctrine, That *Baptism* saveth us, not the laying aside the filth of our flesh, but the answer of a good conscience to God. For were the profession of Christianity celebrated by the Sacrament of Baptism, believed to be that which saveth us; men would not go to baptize them, as not baptized, who by their profession (which they acknowledge by seeking the Communion of the Church) are under that bond, which intitleth them to the Salvation of Christians. Nor can there

there be any greater presumption, than the voiding of Baptism so celebrated, that they expect Salvation upon other terms. But in making void Baptism ministr'd by sprinkling alone, without dipping, they neglect *St. Peter* again, when he maketh the Baptism that saveth, not to consist in cleansing the flesh, but in a due profession of Christianity; signifying this to be the principal, that only the accessory Ceremony which it is solemnized with. And therefore they are to acknowledg this difference, by acknowledging Baptism so ministr'd to be good and valid, not void. But this being acknowledged, well may they insist, that it is unduly ministr'd: For it is evident, that neither the Scripture, nor the practice of the whole Church, can by any means allow the sprinkling of water for Baptism; though the pouring on of water in case of necessity be allowed. Nor doth the Law of the Church of *England* allow any more than pouring water upon a Child that is weak, commanding therefore dipping otherwise. And therefore this Law being much weakened by the tenderness of Mothers and Friends (supposing all Infants weak, which the Law supposeth not) and by undue zeal for Forreign Fashions, ought to be revived and brought into use by all Ordinaries, that there may remain no colour for such an offence. And therefore reparation is to be made for the sacrilege of the late Wars, in destroying the Fonts of Baptism in Churches, and bringing in Christning out of *Baptism* by force.

I cannot say, that I have touch'd all that is fit to be touch'd; but I hope that I have said nothing, but that which followeth upon the ground, which I have justified. That which is propos'd, and is not so justified, seems to demand the consent of those who propose it, as able to hold the Church divided; if they be not contented; but that calls to mind a reason on the other side, that men use to get a stomach with eating in such cases. The due measure is not the satisfying of mens appetites, but the improvement of our common Christianity.

F I N I S.

